NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

Congressional Information Service, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

CIS

Calendar No. 971

97TH CONGRESS
2d Session
SENATE
REPORT
No. 97–673

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1983

DECEMBER 6 (legislative day, NOVEMBER 30), 1982.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 3079]

The Committee on Appropriations reports to the Senate the bill (S. 3079) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1983, and for other purposes, and presents herewith information relative to the contents of the bill.

AMOUNT IN NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1983

Amount of bill recommended to the House	$13,599,036,000
Budget estimates considered by House Committee	13,669,219,000
Budget estimates considered by Senate Committee	13,669,219,000
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	13,534,581,000
Amount of appropriations, 1982	12,611,325,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Over the appropriations, 1982	+923,256,000
Under the budget estimate, 1983	−134,638,000
Under the House-passed bill	−64,455,000

S183-17

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

TITLE I

Department of Energy:

Page
Atomic energy defense activities 88
Departmental administration 119
Energy supply, research and development 11
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 136
General science and research 78
Geothermal Resources Development Fund 138
Nuclear fuel cycle activities 60

Power marketing administrations:

Alaska Power Administration 130
Bonneville Power Administration 131
Southeastern Power Administration 133
Southwestern Power Administration 134
Western Area Power Administration 135

TITLE II

Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:
Corps of Engineers—Civil:

Construction, general 160
Flood control and coastal emergencies 209
General expenses 209
General investigations 140
Mississippi River and tributaries 179
Operation and maintenance, general 186
Special recreation use fees 209

TITLE III

Department of the Interior:
Bureau of Reclamation:

Construction program 219
General administrative expenses 235
General investigations 210
Loan program 231
Operation and maintenance 231

TITLE IV

Independent Agencies:

Appalachian Regional Commission 236
Delaware River Basin Commission 238
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin 239
Nuclear Regulatory Commission 239
Susquehanna River Basin Commission 238
Tennessee Valley Authority 241
Water Resources Council 244

INTRODUCTION

As stated in previous years, energy and water are the fundamental, inseparable subjects of this appropriation bill. Simply stated these resources are the Nation's lifeblood. Only with secure supplies and careful management of these, our most precious resources, can our Nation be assured of a secure, stable, and prosperous future. And, the wise use, development and management of these resources for current needs and thoughtful conservation for future needs are essential.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 1983 beginning October 1, 1982 and ending September 30, 1983 for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for the Department of Energy (except for fossil fuel programs, and certain conservation and regulatory programs) in title I; for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works program in title II; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian Regional Development Programs, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The President's fiscal year 1983 budget estimates for this bill totals $13,669,219,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $13,534,581,000. This is a decrease of $134,638,000 below the budget estimates and $64,455,000 below the House bill.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $5,707,491,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Testing	$449,300,000
Research and development	737,300,000
Weapons activities	3,322,141,000
Nuclear materials production	1,314,060,000
Defense waste management	528,770,000

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $1,827,648,000 for energy supply, research, development and demonstration programs including:

Solar energy	$187,877,000
Geothermal energy	39,240,000
Hydropower	2,000,000
Nuclear fission	537,391,000
Magnetic fusion	462,800,000
Environmental	189,540,000
Basic energy sciences	282,850,000

NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE ACTIVITIES

The bill also includes a net appropriation of $40,621,000 for nuclear fuel cycle activities. Major activities include:

Enriched uranium production facilities	$525,000,000
Clinch River Breeder Reactor project	195,000,000
Nuclear fuel cycle research and development	49,275,000
Nuclear waste disposal activities	185,000,000
Revenues applied	−2,307,900,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation also provides $607,205,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics and nuclear physics including:

Life science and nuclear medicine applications	$40,320,000
High energy physics research	426,235,000
Nuclear physics	130,950,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $818,504,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs and activities include:

Appalachian regional development programs	$145,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	89,100,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	474,500,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	107,065,000

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $3,839,826,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the areas of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Major programs related to water resources development include:

Corps of Engineers—Civil:	
General investigations	$140,372,000
Construction activities	1,456,596,000
Operations and maintenance activities	1,223,928,000
Bureau of Reclamation:	
General investigations	33,362,000
Construction activities	638,785,000
Operations and maintenance activities	136,850,000
Tennessee Valley Authority:	
Construction activities	27,806,000
Operating expenses	19,988,000

WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Both this Committee and the House Committee have stated on numerous occasions that water is this Nation's most precious and valuable resource, the basic need of all life. Therefore, it is clear that the adequate supply of water is as important, if not more important, than energy.

As stated by the House Committee, and strongly concurred with here, the question is "How rapidly should our valuable water resources be developed?" not "Should we develop our water resources?"

The Congress of the United States should be proud of the completed water resource development projects in all 50 States. They stand as an eloquent monument to the vision and commitment of those who foresaw the need for public development for a viable inland waterway system, vital flood control and water supply facilities, hydroelectric and irrigation facilities with widespread public benefits, and coastal ports and harbors that provide for our economic well-being.

Though relatively small in the context of the total annual Federal budget, a little over 0.6 percent, investments in water resource projects have beneficial effects that touch every facet of our society. This development forms the underpinning, the physical web needed to provide both the necessities taken for granted and the luxuries that Americans enjoy today.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN AMERICA

A little noticed, but highly important issue with regard to the Federal budget of the United States, is the question of what portion of the budget should be devoted to capital investment projects. The rapid proliferation and expansion of the many social programs funded by the Federal Government have, of course, brought significant benefits to the American people. But we must never lose perspective of the fact that the revenues to support these and future social programs must be generated by a productive economy. An economy can maintain and increase its productivity only if there is a satisfactory rate of capital investment in both the private sector and the public sector.

Just as a private company must make capital investments to assure future production and growth, the Government must make capital investments of a public nature to assure a foundation for the future growth and prosperity of the Nation.

The importance in the future of what we do today perhaps can be best assessed by evaluating the importance now of what was done in the past. One has only to envision great cities like Omaha and St. Louis or Memphis and New Orleans virtually unprotected from periodic ravages of Missouri and Mississippi River floodwaters or a U.S. transportation system without deep draft harbors and inland waterways on which to transport the vast quantities of bulk commodities moving to and from the Nation's heartland to realize that this country would have attained only a fraction of its economic and social potential without the benefit of past expenditures on water resource development. The significance of these investments can be easily understood by thinking in the abstract of what the Nation would be without them, but we need not rely on abstractions to demonstrate their value. It is possible to obtain a measure of value by examining tangible returns—both to the Nation as a whole and to individual communities and groups of citizens throughout the country.

In addition to promoting interstate commerce, protecting life and property, enhancing fish and wildlife habitats, and providing opportunities for outdoor recreation, water resources projects of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority are national investments that not only provide tangible monetary returns, but also stimulate economic growth and development, and reduce public and private economic losses resulting from both excesses and deficiencies in streamflow. Like almost all capital investments, these projects provide tangible and intangible returns throughout their useful lives—many of which will extend decades into the future. Consequently, investments in water resources projects—unlike most other types of Federal investments—are authorized specifically on the basis of anticipated return on the investment. And while the tangible returns on Federal investments in water resources projects are important, they are not the sole consideration in evaluating the importance of the water resource development program. Water resource projects also play important roles in achieving and maintaining environmental conditions that improve the quality of life for all Americans. They also afford substantial opportunities for management and protection of the quality of water and related land resources. Under Federal management, the waters and adjacent lands comprising a Corps of Engineers or Bureau of Reclamation project are protected from degradation that would result from uncontrolled use and abuse.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS TO THE PRIVATE SECTOR

The Commttee believes that it is important to point out that the overwhelming percentage of Federal funds for public works projects in the bill is expended in the private sector. For example, the turbines, steel, cement, and other materials used to build these projects are manufactured and marketed by private industry. The actual construction of the projects is contracted to private industry through Government contracts.

In addition to providing a base on which private investment can build, water resources expenditures stimulate local and regional employment—particularly important in this period of high unemployment. The impact of the employment created by these projects differs for different activities. For construction and major rehabilitation projects, the employment effects are concentrated primarily in the construction industry. Other kinds of expenditures such as operation and maintenance at many project sites provide employment for a variety of unskilled and semiskilled workers. It should be kept in mind that these are productive jobs resulting in tangible benefits for the American people, such as power on line, improved harbors, flood control facilities and expanded irrigation, unlike temporary public service jobs from which little permanent benefits may be derived.

The investment of Federal funds in the development of water resources has a far greater impact on the Nation than the direct benefits mentioned above. It must be recognized that, in addition, these projects have an important indirect impact on community and regional development by contributing to economic growth through private investment.

NEW CONSTRUCTION START POLICY

In formulating the bill, the Committee has agreed with the House Committee to a policy of no new construction starts for fiscal 1983.

It is important to note that the administration has not addressed the total national water policy issue. Although a limited number of new projects has been recommended as new construction starts by the administration if certain cost-sharing criteria has been met, the Congress has not been presented a comprehensive program for consideration.

The Committee is aware that Assistant Secretary of the Army and Department of the Interior personnel have contacted project sponsors around the country to inform them of the so-called innovative financing proposals that they must agree to if they want their projects to be planned or constructed. Since the appropriate committees of Congress have not as yet addressed the innovative financing issue, it may well be that project sponsors are reviewing a program that Congress may not implement.

The Committee feels that projects should be reviewed on their merit and need, not on the basis that "if you have money your project will go to the top of the list." There are severely depressed areas of this country, including those with extremely high unemployment, that may well have as much or more need for flood control, hydropower, municipal and industrial water, navigation projects, and rehabilitation of existing projects but do not have the money to participate in this program.

The Committee has received numerous meritorious requests for new construction starts and rehabilitation of existing projects including, but not limited to, those proposed by the administration. However, all of the cognizant authorizing committees of Congress have not fully addressed the policy issues embodied in up-front financing and cost sharing by non-Federal sponsors. Until Congress fully considers and addresses such policy issues, the Committee believes that no up-front financing and cost sharing should be implemented.

The Committee is aware of the importance of these new projects and the unsettling effects continued delay will have on the needs and plans of local and State governments, the private sector, and affected citizens of the area. Therefore, the new construction start policy set forth here by the Committee is with the understanding and assurance that a number of highly meritorious and eligible projects, now awaiting appropriations to begin construction, will be given prompt and full consideration by the Committee at the earliest opportunity.

AGENCY TESTIMONY BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Since March 29, 1982, the administration through revision of OMB Circular A–10 has prevented Federal agencies from providing certain funding information to this Committee. The Committee feels strongly that providing data on what level of funding can be efficiently utilized is an important responsibility of the Department of Energy, Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and all other Government departments and agencies, and a "gag order" of this type is counterproductive.

Funding capabilities are an expression of the ability to utilize funds and provide the opportunity to present updated information which is critical in this Committee's development of funding recommendations. Further, these data are of prime importance to the Congress in evaluating funding options and priorities.

Notwithstanding the constitutional responsibilities of Congress in the formulation of the Federal budget, the Committee feels that the legislative and executive branches must work together in establishing fiscal policy of this Nation. In order to be effective, eliminate unnecessary duplication, and get the most from available resources, the Committee must have unencumbered testimony and data from those responsible for carrying out program plans.

Funding decisions made by the Congress in annual appropriations bills occur only after careful consideration of the President's budget, testimony by hundreds of departmental and nondepartmental witnesses, assessment of national needs, and regional considerations. The Appropriations Committee has the responsibility to consider input from all interested parties and has traditionally limited changes to the President's budget to programs which have been justified in testimony or which reflect more current information and conditions. This is particularly important considering the fact that the budget, which becomes operative on October 1, was developed 18 months before the effective date within the executive branch and Federal agencies.

The Committee believes that use of capabilities developed by the agencies and furnished to the Committee has never been used as a budget buster. Rather, the Committee has used these capabilities judiciously, in passing appropriation bills that are more current than the budget request and which reflect due consideration of the need for fiscal constraint.

The Committee feels that withholding capabilities will result in increased pressures to add projects and programs which have not had a professional evaluation by DOE, the Corps, or other Federal agencies as to its ability to utilize the funds. Further, the Committee views OMB's action as an attempt by the administration to exclude the Congress from its proper role of evaluating executive branch budget requests, as well as considering input from Members of Congress and local interests. In the absence of funding information, the Committee will be forced to rely on estimates and data developed by others who are less qualified and have not had proper scientific and technical review of responsible experts within the executive branch. Such a procedure would undoubtedly result in misallocations of funds and higher Federal spending.

The Committee feels strongly that altering the free exchange of information, particularly during this era of limited fiscal resources is a serious mistake and is counter to the policy of holding down Federal spending. Accordingly, the Committee urges the OMB to rescind its previous revisions to OMB Circular A–10 which preclude disclosure of any funding capabilities in excess of the President's budget. Further, this Committee expects all agencies to respond fully and freely, and to provide the information requested which is critical in developing and reviewing annual budget proposals.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held 17 sessions of hearings (15 different days) in connection with the fiscal year 1982 appropriation bill. One closed hearing session was held on classified matters in this bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies; numerous Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local government officials and representatives; and hundreds of citizens of all walks of life from throughout the United States. Testimony, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

The subcommittee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present, on November 30, 1982, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the full Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present on December 2, 1982, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

The following items of appropriations recommended by the Committee, not made to carry out the provisions of existing law or an act passed by the Senate in this session, are brought to the attention of the Senate in accordance with rule XVI, paragraph 7.

Page 2, nuclear fuel cycle activities is recommended to consolidate certain authorized activities under the Department of Energy into a single appropriation.

Page 5, under atomic energy defense activities, the annual authorization for fiscal 1983 appropriations for operating expenses and plant and capital equipment has not been passed by the Senate in this session.

Page 19, under general investigations, an amendment is included providing appropriations for the Farmers Irrigation District, for which there is no authorization.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in the bill provide for Department of Energy programs relating to energy supply, research, and development activities; general science and research activities; atomic energy defense activities; departmental administration; power marketing activities; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and the geothermal resources development fund. A new appropriation, nuclear fuel cycle activities, merges uranium supply and enrichment activities with other related nuclear fuel cycle programs.

The budget request for the Department of Energy in fiscal 1983 assumed enactment of legislation by the Congress to dismantle the Department and merge its functions into the Departments of Commerce, Interior, and Justice and establish the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as a totally independent agency. At the time the Committee reported the appropriation bill accompanying this report, neither the House nor the Senate had acted on the administration's legislative proposal and it appears unlikely that any action will occur during this session of Congress. For this reason, the Committee's recommendations are based on an account structure essentially identical to that used in previous years' appropriation acts. The fiscal year 1983 bill, however, consolidates operating expenses and capital expenses activities under the major individual appropriations.

Single appropriation accounts are provided for the nuclear fuel cycle activities, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the geothermal resources development fund and for each power marketing administration except Western Area Power Administration which has three.

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1982	$1,649,609,000
Budget estimate, 1983	1,350,715,000
House allowance	1,541,258,000
Committee recommendation	1,577,992,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+227,277,000
House allowance	+36,734,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1982	$343,370,000
Budget estimate, 1983	217,456,000
House allowance	288,356,000
Committee recommendation	249,656,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+32,200,000
House allowance	−38,700,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,827,648,000 for energy supply, research, and development activities. The purpose of these funds is to support the development of new energy technologies and improve the efficiency of existing technologies. Included are the development and demonstration of solar energy, wind, ocean systems, biomass, geothermal, nuclear fission and fusion, electric energy systems, and energy storage. Efforts associated with basic energy sciences and environmental research are also included.

The following tabulation shows the Committee's recommendations by program for new budget authority in comparison with the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
SOLAR ENERGY				
I. Solar applications for buildings				
A. Active solar heating and cooling				
Operating expenses	11,000,000	---	6,150,000	6,150,000
Capital equipment	500,000	---	500,000	500,000
Subtotal,Active solar heating and cooling	11,500,000	---	6,650,000	6,650,000
B. Passive solar heating and cooling				
Operating expenses	10,100,000	---	5,000,000	5,000,000
Capital equipment	500,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Passive solar heating and cooling	10,600,000	---	5,000,000	5,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Photovoltaic energy systems				
Operating expenses	71,000,000	27,035,000	47,035,000	58,035,000
Capital equipment	3,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Photovoltaic energy systems	74,000,000	27,035,000	47,035,000	58,035,000
Subtotal, Solar applications for buildings	96,100,000	27,035,000	58,685,000	69,685,000
(Operating expenses)	(92,100,000)	(27,035,000)	(58,185,000)	(69,185,000)
(Capital equipment)	(4,000,000)	---	(500,000)	(500,000)
II. Solar applications for industry				
A. Solar thermal energy systems				
Operating expenses	52,650,000	17,625,000	47,100,000	47,100,000
Capital equipment	2,300,000	400,000	400,000	400,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
76-2-b 10mw central receiver solar thermal pilot plant, Barstow, California	1,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Solar thermal energy system	55,950,000	18,025,000	47,500,000	47,500,000
B. Biomass energy systems				
Operating expenses	19,500,000	6,605,000	12,000,000	16,000,000
Capital equipment	1,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Biomass energy systems	20,500,000	6,605,000	12,000,000	16,000,000
Subtotal, Solar applications for industry	76,450,000	24,630,000	59,500,000	63,500,000
(Operating expenses)	(72,150,000)	(24,230,000)	(59,100,000)	(63,100,000)
(Capital equipment)	(3,300,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)
(Construction)	(1,000,000)	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Solar applications for power				
A. Wind energy systems				
Operating expenses	33,700,000	5,385,000	28,300,000	28,300,000
Capital equipment	700,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, Wind energy systems	34,400,000	5,485,000	28,400,000	28,400,000
B. Ocean energy systems				
Operating expenses	20,300,000	---	10,500,000	7,000,000
Capital equipment	500,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Ocean energy systems	20,800,000	---	10,500,000	7,000,000
Subtotal, Solar applications for power	55,200,000	5,485,000	38,900,000	35,400,000
(Operating expenses)	(54,000,000)	(5,385,000)	(38,800,000)	(35,300,000)
(Capital equipment)	(1,200,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
V. Other solar energy				
A. International solar energy program - OE.......	4,000,000	9,500,000	10,000,000	6,000,000
B. Solar information systems - OE................	6,700,000	---	3,000,000	3,000,000
C. Solar Reserve Account - OE....................	12,311,000	---	---	---
E. Alcohol fuels.................................	10,000,000	2,940,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
F. Program support - OE..........................	3,463,000	500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
G. Program direction - OE........................	4,000,000	2,146,000	4,292,000	4,292,000
Subtotal, Other solar energy.....................	40,474,000	15,086,000	23,292,000	19,292,000
TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY..............................	268,224,000	72,236,000	180,377,000	187,877,000
(Operating expenses).............................	(258,724,000)	(71,736,000)	(179,377,000)	(186,877,000)
(Capital equipment).............................	(8,500,000)	(500,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)
(Construction).................................	(1,000,000)	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GEOTHERMAL				
I. Hydrothermal industrialization				
Operating expenses	8,624,000	---	---	3,500,000
Construction:				
80-G-2 Binary 50 MWE demo plant	8,558,000	---	30,000,000	15,000,000
(By transfer)	(14,000,000)	---	---	---
Subtotal, Hydrothermal industrialization	17,182,000	---	30,000,000	18,500,000
II. Geopressured resources				
Operating expenses	16,686,000	2,440,000	8,440,000	4,440,000

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Geothermal technology development				
Operating expenses	19,576,000	6,720,000	9,672,000	14,800,000
Capital equipment	860,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Subtotal, Geothermal technology development	20,436,000	6,970,000	9,922,000	15,050,000
IV. Program direction - OE	1,600,000	400,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
TOTAL, GEOTHERMAL	55,904,000	9,810,000	49,612,000	39,240,000
(Operating expenses)	(46,486,000)	(9,560,000)	(19,362,000)	(23,990,000)
(Capital equipment)	(860,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)
(Construction)	(8,558,000)	---	(30,000,000)	(15,000,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
HYDROPOWER				
I. Small scale hydropower development - OE..........	2,750,000	---	1,750,000	1,750,000
III. Program direction - OE..........................	250,000	---	250,000	250,000
	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------
TOTAL, HYDROPOWER...................................	3,000,000	---	2,000,000	2,000,000
ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE				
I. Electric energy systems				
A. Electric field effects				
Operating expenses..........................	7,100,000	---	2,600,000	2,600,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Power delivery				
Reliability research and development..........	9,325,000	---	3,900,000	3,900,000
Capital equipment...........................	400,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Reliability R & D.....................	9,725,000	---	3,900,000	3,900,000
C. Systems technology - OE......................	3,600,000	---	10,200,000	10,200,000
D. Program direction - OE.......................	875,000	---	500,000	500,000
Subtotal,Electric energy systems................	21,300,000	---	17,200,000	17,200,000
(Operating expenses)...........................	(20,900,000)	---	(17,200,000)	(17,200,000)
(Capital equipment)...........................	(400,000)	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Energy Storage Systems				
A. Electrochemical storage				
Operating expenses	22,050,000	---	18,000,000	18,000,000
Capital equipment	700,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Battery storage	22,750,000	---	18,000,000	18,000,000
B. Physical and chemical storage				
Operating expenses	14,850,000	---	7,000,000	7,000,000
Capital equipment	400,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Physical and chemical storage	15,250,000	---	7,000,000	7,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Program direction - OE	500,000	---	700,000	700,000
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	38,500,000	---	25,700,000	25,700,000
(Operating expenses)	(37,400,000)	---	(25,700,000)	(25,700,000)
(Capital equipment)	(1,100,000)	---	---	---
TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE	59,800,000	---	42,900,000	42,900,000
(Operating expenses)	(58,300,000)	---	(42,900,000)	(42,900,000)
(Capital equipment)	(1,500,000)	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
NUCLEAR				
I. Converter reactor				
A. High temperature reactor technology				
Operating expenses	33,500,000	---	35,000,000	33,500,000
Capital equipment	1,800,000	---	---	1,500,000
Subtotal, High temperature reactor technology	35,300,000	---	35,000,000	35,000,000
B. Light water reactor systems				
Operating expenses	21,600,000	4,000,000	15,000,000	4,000,000
Capital equipment	523,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Light water reactor systems	22,123,000	4,000,000	15,000,000	4,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Three Mile Island activities				
Operating expenses............................	23,750,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	24,000,000
Capital equipment.............................	8,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	3,000,000
Subtotal, Three Mile Island activities...........	31,750,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
D. Advanced reactor systems				
Operating expenses............................	3,935,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
Capital equipment.............................	200,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Advanced reactor systems...............	4,135,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
E. Program direction - OE........................	1,422,000	983,000	983,000	983,000
Subtotal, Converter reactor......................	94,730,000	36,783,000	82,783,000	71,783,000
(Operating expenses).............................	(84,207,000)	(30,783,000)	(76,783,000)	(67,283,000)
(Capital equipment).............................	(10,523,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(4,500,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Commercial nuclear waste				
1. Terminal isolation				
Operating expenses........................	177,535,000	43,650,000	43,650,000	37,650,000
Capital equipment........................	9,017,000	6,750,000	6,750,000	6,750,000
Subtotal, Terminal isolation..................	186,552,000	50,400,000	50,400,000	44,400,000
2. Waste systems evaluation and public inter.				
Operating expenses........................	9,085,000	10,925,000	9,925,000	9,925,000
Capital equipment........................	100,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
Subtotal, Waste systems evaluation...........	9,185,000	11,375,000	10,375,000	10,375,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
3. Program direction - OE	2,645,000	3,314,000	3,314,000	3,314,000
Subtotal, Commercial nuclear waste	198,382,000	65,089,000	64,089,000	58,089,000
(Operating expenses)	(189,265,000)	(57,889,000)	(56,889,000)	(50,889,000)
(Capital equipment)	(9,117,000)	(7,200,000)	(7,200,000)	(7,200,000)
III. Remedial action				
1. Management of surplus radioactivity contaminated DOE facilities				
Operating expenses	11,800,000	12,700,000	12,700,000	8,900,000
Capital equipment	175,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Management of surplus radioactivity contaminated DOE facilities	11,975,000	12,900,000	12,900,000	9,100,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
2. Remedial action for former DOE contractors installation MED/AEC sites				
Operating expenses	11,245,000	11,700,000	11,700,000	11,700,000
Capital equipment	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
Subtotal, Remedial action for former DOE cont installation MED/AEC sites	11,245,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
3. Grand Junction remedial action OE	1,644,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
4. Remedial action for inactive uranium mill tailings sites				
Operating expenses	17,228,000	22,280,000	12,280,000	22,280,000
Capital equipment	600,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
Subtotal, Remedial action for inactive uranium mill tailings sites	17,828,000	23,180,000	13,180,000	23,180,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
5. West Valley				
Operating expenses	9,772,000	12,400,000	12,400,000	12,400,000
Capital equipment	200,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Construction:				
83-N-327 West Valley demo. project West Valley, N.Y.	---	2,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, West Valley	9,972,000	15,400,000	14,400,000	15,400,000
6. Program direction - OE	337,000	420,000	420,000	420,000
Subtotal, Remedial action	53,001,000	65,700,000	54,700,000	61,900,000
(Operating expenses)	(52,026,000)	(61,300,000)	(51,300,000)	(57,500,000)
(Capital equipment)	(975,000)	(2,400,000)	(2,400,000)	(2,400,000)
(Construction)	---	(2,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(2,000,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Advanced nuclear systems				
A. Space and terrestrial applications				
Operating expenses	---	27,500,000	27,500,000	27,500,000
Capital equipment	2,846,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
Subtotal, Space and terrestrial applications	2,846,000	29,300,000	29,300,000	29,300,000
B. Advanced systems evaluations				
Operating expenses	33,551,000	---	---	---
C. Program direction - OE	1,177,000	1,326,000	1,326,000	1,326,000
Subtotal, Advanced nuclear systems	37,574,000	30,626,000	30,626,000	30,626,000
(Operating expenses)	(34,728,000)	(28,826,000)	(28,826,000)	(28,826,000)
(Capital equipment)	(2,846,000)	(1,800,000)	(1,800,000)	(1,800,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
V. Breeder reactor systems				
A. Liquid metal fast breeder reactor				
Operating expenses..............................	306,500,000	234,434,000	265,434,000	234,434,000
Capital equipment..............................	22,374,000	17,900,000	17,900,000	17,900,000
Construction:				
83-N-334 Safeguards & sec. Assess, imp., ANL,INEL,Id......................	---	400,000	400,000	400,000
83-N-331 GPP.................................	---	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
83-N-332 Mods. to reac.,bar. var. loc........	---	900,000	900,000	900,000
82-N-312 General plant projects...............	7,468,000	---	---	---
82-N-310 Modifications to reactors...........	2,000,000	---	---	---
78-6-C Safety research experimental facility, INEL, Idaho (A-E, Long-lead procurement and limited construction only).....................	8,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
78-6-E Liquid metal engineering center modifications, liquid metal engineering center, Santa Susana, California (A-E and long-lead procurement only)...................	4,900,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
78-6-F Fuels & materials examination facility, richland, WA........................	38,700,000	---	10,800,000	---
Subtotal, Construction........................	61,068,000	18,300,000	29,100,000	18,300,000
Subtotal, Liquid metal fast breeder reactor......	389,942,000	270,634,000	312,434,000	270,634,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Conceptual design-alt. breeder concepts - OE..	---	---	2,500,000	---
D. Water cooled breeder reactor				
Operating expenses............................	50,500,000	41,800,000	41,800,000	41,800,000
Capital equipment............................	1,000,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, Water cooled breeder reactor...........	51,500,000	42,000,000	42,000,000	42,000,000
Program direction............................	9,588,000	12,359,000	12,359,000	12,359,000
Subtotal, Breeder reactor systems.................	451,030,000	324,993,000	369,293,000	324,993,000
(Operating expenses)............................	(366,588,000)	(288,593,000)	(322,093,000)	(288,593,000)
(Capital equipment)............................	(23,374,000)	(18,100,000)	(18,100,000)	(18,100,000)
(Construction)............................	(61,068,000)	(18,300,000)	(29,100,000)	(18,300,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
General reduction (operating expenses)...........	---	---	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR....................................	834,717,000	523,191,000	591,491,000	537,391,000
(Operating expenses)..............................	(726,814,000)	(467,391,000)	(525,891,000)	(483,091,000)
(Capital equipment)...............................	(46,835,000)	(35,500,000)	(35,500,000)	(34,000,000)
(Construction)...................................	(61,068,000)	(20,300,000)	(30,100,000)	(20,300,000)
ENVIRONMENT				
I. Environment, safety and health:				
Operating expenses..........................	44,732,000	32,145,000	30,145,000	32,145,000
Capital equipment...........................	4,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Construction:				
83-E-350 LGF spill test facility, NTS........	---	---	3,000,000	---
Subtotal, Overview and assessment.............	48,732,000	33,645,000	34,645,000	33,645,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Biological and environmental research				
Operating expenses........................	148,048,000	118,400,000	128,400,000	138,400,000
Capital equipment.........................	9,700,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
Construction:				
83-E-306 General plant projects..........	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
82-GPP-1 General plant projects..........	3,000,000	---	---	---
82-V-305 Modifications and additions to biomedical and environmental research facilities, various locations............	1,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction......................	4,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Biological and environ. research....	161,748,000	126,900,000	136,900,000	146,900,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Program direction - OE...........................				
A. Overview and assessment - PD............	6,615,000	5,350,000	7,050,000	5,650,000
B. Bio. and env. research - PD.............	2,621,000	2,945,000	2,945,000	3,345,000
Subtotal, Program direction - OE.............	9,236,000	8,295,000	9,995,000	8,995,000
Total, Environment..............................	219,716,000	168,840,000	181,540,000	189,540,000
(Operating expenses)............................	(202,016,000)	(158,840,000)	(168,540,000)	(179,540,000)
(Capital equipment)............................	(13,700,000)	(9,000,000)	(9,000,000)	(9,000,000)
(Construction)............................	(4,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(1,000,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
FUSION				
I. Magnetic fusion				
A. Confinement systems				
Operating expenses	123,727,000	181,000,000	175,000,000	190,000,000
Capital equipment	18,210,000	21,800,000	21,800,000	21,800,000
Construction:				
80-MF-3 EBT Proof of principal exp	13,446,000	---	14,000,000	5,500,000
Subtotal, Confinement systems	155,383,000	202,800,000	210,800,000	217,300,000
B. Development and technology				
Operating expenses	60,831,000	74,300,000	74,300,000	74,300,000
Capital equipment	12,700,000	9,700,000	9,700,000	9,700,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
80-MF-4 Large coil test fac, Phase I	6,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Development and technology	79,531,000	84,000,000	84,000,000	84,000,000
C. Applied plasma physics				
Operating expenses	66,758,000	73,300,000	73,300,000	73,300,000
Capital equipment	6,200,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	6,200,000
Subtotal, Applied plasma physics	72,958,000	77,300,000	77,300,000	79,500,000
D. Planning and projects				
Operating expenses	31,015,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
Capital equipment	4,890,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Construction:				
83-GPP General plant projects	---	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
78-3-A Mirror fusion test facility	39,858,000	40,000,000	55,000,000	40,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
76-5-A Tokamak fusion test reactor Princeton plasma physics lab, NJ..............	40,100,000	---	---	---
78-3-B Fusion materials irradiation test facility, Hanford engineering lab,WA.........	9,000,000	---	2,000,000	2,000,000
Prior year projects..........................	5,700,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction........................	94,658,000	46,000,000	63,000,000	48,000,000
Subtotal, Planning and projects..................	130,563,000	76,000,000	93,000,000	78,000,000
E. Center for magnetic fusion energy - OE........	9,150,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
F. Program direction - OE	3,646,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Total, Fusion	451,231,000	444,100,000	469,100,000	462,800,000
(Operating expenses)	(295,127,000)	(358,600,000)	(352,600,000)	(367,600,000)
(Capital equipment)	(42,000,000)	(39,500,000)	(39,500,000)	(41,700,000)
(Construction)	(114,104,000)	(46,000,000)	(77,000,000)	(53,500,000)
SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS				
I. Basic energy sciences				
A. Nuclear sciences				
Operating expenses	22,407,000	30,644,000	30,644,000	30,644,000
Capital equipment	860,000	1,556,000	1,556,000	1,556,000
Subtotal, Nuclear sciences	23,267,000	32,200,000	32,200,000	32,200,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Materials sciences				
Operating expenses	95,506,000	108,700,000	108,700,000	108,700,000
Capital equipment	7,960,000	8,510,000	8,510,000	8,510,000
Construction:				
83-E-301 Improvs. to weapons Neutron ras. fac., LASL, N.M.	---	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
83-E-303 GPP, var. loc	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
82-E-321 Acc. improvement mods	300,000	---	---	---
82-E-320 General plant projects	300,000	---	---	---
82-E-322 High temperature material lab	---	---	---	2,500,000
Subtotal, Construction	600,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	5,500,000
Subtotal, Materials sciences	104,066,000	120,210,000	120,210,000	122,710,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Chemical sciences				
Operating expenses	63,187,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000
Capital equipment	4,800,000	5,510,000	5,510,000	5,510,000
Construction:				
83-E-302	---	400,000	400,000	400,000
Subtotal, Chemical sciences	67,987,000	75,910,000	75,910,000	75,910,000
D. Engineering, mathematical, and geosciences				
Operating expenses	24,864,000	31,050,000	31,050,000	31,050,000
Capital equipment	1,900,000	1,920,000	1,920,000	1,920,000
Subtotal, Engineering, math., and geosciences	26,764,000	32,970,000	32,970,000	32,970,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Advanced energy projects				
Operating expenses	7,310,000	8,300,000	8,300,000	8,300,000
Capital equipment	320,000	290,000	290,000	290,000
Subtotal, Advanced energy projects	7,630,000	8,590,000	8,590,000	8,590,000
F. Biological energy research				
Operating expenses	8,419,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
Capital equipment	410,000	370,000	370,000	370,000
Subtotal, Biological energy research	8,829,000	9,870,000	9,870,000	9,870,000
G. Program direction - OE	2,500,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
I. Planning, engineering and design	---	---	2,000,000	---
H. Other capital equipment - CE	140,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
H. General reduction - OE	---	---	-2,000,000	-2,500,000
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences	241,183,000	282,850,000	282,850,000	282,850,000
(Operating expenses)	(224,193,000)	(261,294,000)	(261,294,000)	(258,794,000)
(Capital equipment)	(16,390,000)	(18,156,000)	(18,156,000)	(18,156,000)
(Construction)	(600,000)	(3,400,000)	(3,400,000)	(5,900,000)
II. Energy oversight, research analy. & Univ support				
A. Energy research analysis - OE				
1. Assessment projects	1,993,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
B. University research support - OE				
1. University institutional agreements	1,981,000	---	---	---
2. University reactor fuel assistance	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,900,000
3. University laboratory coop. program	3,600,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
4. Energy graduate traineeship program	1,000,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
5. Energy manpower assessment program..........	500,000	---	---	---
6. Education and training......................	1,700,000	---	---	1,700,000
Subtotal, University research support - OE.......	10,381,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	7,100,000
C. Program direction and oversight - OE..........	2,925,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Subtotal, Energy oversight, res analy, & Univ sup	15,299,000	10,900,000	10,900,000	12,900,000
III. Multi-program facilities				
Construction:				
83-E-308 Rep power sys,INEL,LLNL,ORNL,RL.....	---	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
83-E-309 Electronics fac., ANL................	---	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
83-E-310 Utility replacements.................	---	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
83-E-311 Emergency response center, ORNL.....	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
82-E-301 300 area utilities (HEDL)...........	1,000,000	6,200,000	6,200,000	6,200,000
82-E-302 Security facility (ANL).............	1,500,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
82-E-305 Traffic safety improvements (HEDL)..	3,000,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
82-E-306 Railroad modifications (INEL).......	2,000,000	---	---	---
81-E-309 Rehab of gen pur plant (ANL)........	---	1,950,000	1,950,000	1,950,000
81-E-310 Trans & distr system upgrade (RL)...	5,000,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
81-E-317 Roof replacement (INEL).............	1,000,000	---	---	---
81-E-318 Upgrade primary substation (ORNL) ..	2,600,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
81-E-321 Site utilities project (LLL)	5,000,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
81-E-323 Fire safety improvements (ANL)	1,500,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
81-E-324 Fire protection impvmts (INEL)......	1,000,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-E-325 Energy Technology Lab (Sandia)......	5,000,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,700,000
80-ES-11 Idaho Lab Facility (INEL)...........	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
General reduction............................	---	---	-3,400,000	-500,000
Subtotal, Multi-program facilities...............	32,600,000	34,000,000	30,600,000	34,000,000
IV. Policy and Management				
A. Policy and management - OE - ER...............	1,040,000	390,000	390,000	1,200,000
B. Policy and management - OE - NE...............	1,610,000	1,584,000	1,584,000	1,584,000
C. Policy and management - OE - EP...............	1,897,000	417,000	417,000	1,513,000
D. Policy and management - OE - CRE..............	813,000	950,000	950,000	950,000
Subtotal, Policy and management..................	5,360,000	3,341,000	3,341,000	5,247,000

SOLAR ENERGY

The administration has proposed again this year substantial reductions in funding for solar energy activities. In general, the Department's role in technology development would be focused on long-term research and development. Increased reliance is placed on private market forces and tax incentives rather than near-term demonstration and development.

The Committee agrees that the marketplace must ultimately decide the future role of the solar technologies. The Committee does not agree, however, that most solar and renewables research has been developed to the point where the private sector alone can be expected to carry forward with its development.

The Committee considers it essential that a viable solar and renewable energy research and development program be maintained in the Department of Energy and that the staff expertise be maintained to properly manage this type of effort. Continued basic research and development of solar and renewable energy is essential to assure our capability to respond to disruptions and fluctuations in supply of finite energy resources and to maintain a balanced energy research program.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends restoration of program funds and staffing levels to carry out this basic research activity. The Committee recommendation for solar energy is $187,877,000, an increase of $7,500,000 from the House allowance but over 30 percent below the fiscal year 1982 level.

Solar applications for buildings.—A total of $69,685,000 is recommended, which is $11,000,000 over the House allowance.

For active systems, the Committee recommendation is the same as the House and $6,650,000 over the budget request. The Committee agrees with the House that research remains to be done on active solar heating and cooling programs. The Committee believes that the breakdown contained in the House report for specific activities should be used only as a general guide by the Department. Additional funding may be needed and should be provided for monitoring and data collection to insure an orderly schedule for information collection on ongoing projects.

For passive systems, $5,000,000 is recommended for passive solar heating and cooling, the same as the House and $5,000,000 over the budget request.

For photovoltaics, the Committee recommends $58,035,000, an increase of $11,000,000 over the House allowance and nearly $13,000,000 below the current year estimates. This level of funding should provide for the highest priority requirements to continue progress in reducing costs and improving efficiencies of photovoltaic systems.

The Committee expects the Department to maintain a balanced program of advanced research, technology development, and systems engineering at SERI, JPL, and Sandia. In addition, the Department is directed to develop a 5-year photovoltaic program with cost reduction and efficiency and reliability improvement objectives for not only modules, flat plat, and concentrators, but also those components necessary for central power and grid connected, distributed power systems. The 5-year plan, which includes funding requirements, should be submitted to the Committee within 120 days following the enactment of the fiscal year 1983 appropriation bill.

Research in developing high efficiency solar cells with low cost material and processing techniques continues to be the major concern in the photovoltaic area. A process with potential for greatly reduced production costs in solar cell fabrication by excimer laser annealing has been brought to the attention of the Committee. An amount of $1,000,000 is included to carry out research in this area providing DOE support on a cost sharing, pay back basis, as approved by the Department.

Within available funds, the Committee recommendation includes up to $2,000,000 of additional funding which may be needed in fiscal year 1983 for the SMUD project.

Solar applications for industry.—An amount of $63,500,000 is included in the Committee recommendation, of which $47,500,000 is for solar thermal and $16,000,000 is for biomass.

For solar thermal energy systems, the recommendation of $47,500,000 is the same as the House allowance and $29,475,000 over the budget request. The Department should continue technology and systems development activities related to solar thermal central receivers and parabolic dishes.

The Committee expects the continued operation of Solar 1 and the central receiver test facility at Sandia. An amount of $9,000,000 is provided for two cost-shared repowering designs and within 90 days of the enactment of this act, the Department is directed to issue the program opportunity notice for engineering for solar thermal repowering projects. The Committee recommendation provides up to $13,400,000 for technology development.

For biomass energy systems, the Committee recommends $16,000,000, which is $4,000,000 over the House allowance and $9,395,000 above the budget request.

The Committee agrees with the House that considerable research and development, not included in the proposed budget request, should be undertaken in order to assure continued momentum in this important renewable energy program and to protect the Federal research investment made to date.

The Committee recommendation includes $4,000,000 for regional biomass energy programs, similar to the successful effort at the Bonneville Power Administration. In addition to providing support for activities at BPA and TVA, the Department shall identify other regions of the country and develop a program to identify and plan for regionally appropriate biomass technologies. $1,400,000 of the funds provided shall be for the region X wood-derived fuels program to be transferred to the BPA.

Solar applications for power.—The recommended allowance is $35,400,000, which includes $28,400,000 for wind systems and $7,000,000 for ocean systems.

For wind energy systems, the Committee recommends $28,400,000, the same as the House allowance and $22,915,000 over the budget request.

The Committee recommendation includes up to $3,000,000 for operational testing of the MOD–2 system, $18,000,000 for MOD–5 development, up to $1,000,000 for continuing wind characteristics activities, and $700,000 for planning and analysis of which $300,000 is included to complete wind systems standards work. An amount of $2,000,000 is provided to continue the Rocky Flats program.

For ocean energy systems, the recommendation provides for $7,000,000 in fiscal year 1983 funds and $4,000,000 in deferred fiscal year 1982 funds for a total of $11,000,000 to continue basic research on ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC). The budget request again proposed to terminate the ocean systems program. The Committee considers termination inappropriate and, therefore, continues funding for all crucial elements of the Federal OTEC effort. This includes $7,000,000 for two designs of the OTEC pilot plant and $4,000,000 for proceeding with an operational land based OTEC facility, open and other advanced thermal cycles, and other activities.

Other solar programs.—A total of $19,292,000 is included for other solar energy activities, which is $4,000,000 below the House allowance and $4,206,000 more than the budget request.

For alcohol fuels, the Committee provides $5,000,000, the same as the House allowance. The recommendation specifically provides for completion of current experiments and efforts on the conversion of ligno-cellulosic fuels to alcohol.

For international solar programs, an amount of $6,000,000 is included, which is $4,000,000 less than the House and $3,500,000 below the budget request.

The Committee provides $5,000,000 for SOLERAS activities and $1,000,000 for international trade development activities as outlined in the House report.

GEOTHERMAL

The Committee believes that the budget request level for geothermal programs, which is over 80 percent lower than fiscal year 1982 levels, is ill-advised and will significantly slow development of the Nation's geothermal resources. For this reason, the Committee recommends $39,240,000 for geothermal activities, an increase of $29,430,000 over the budget request and $10,372,000 below the House allowance.

Hydrothermal industrialization.—The Committee provides $15,000,000 for construction of project 80–G–2, the binary cycle demonstration plant. This funding will continue progress on the project and supplement $33,000,000 approved in prior years, including $14,000,000 transferred from another account as part of the fiscal year 1982 Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 97–257).

The recommendation also includes $2,500,000 to complete preconstruction activity for the cost-shared hybrid powerplant project near Susanville, Calif. Additional funding is provided to continue funding at lower levels for State projects relating to resource development, resource assessment, technical assistance, and related activities.

Geopressured resources.—An amount of $4,440,000 is provided for geopressured resources, $2,000,000 over the budget request and $4,000,000 below the House allowance. Funds will allow flow tests on four wells designed and drilled especially to reveal geopressured reservoir performance under production conditions, plus testing one well previously drilled by industry.

Geothermal technology development.—The recommendation includes $15,050,000 for technology development, which is $5,128,000 over the House allowance and $8,080,000 above the budget request.

The Committee includes $7,500,000 to continue the hot dry rock technology program. An additional $3,000,000 is provided for hydrothermal technology, including drilling and completion technology and well stimulation activities.

HYDROPOWER

The Committee recommendation includes $2,000,000 for small-scale hydropower, the same as the House allowance.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE

The administration requested no funds for electric energy and energy storage systems on the assumption that this type of research would be conducted by the private sector. The Committee has found, however, that this type of research is unlikely to be supported by the private sector because of its very nature—high risk and long term. The Committee believes, furthermore, that the potential payoff in energy savings far outweighs the costs and that it is in the national interest to continue a modest program of research.

The Committee recommends $42,900,000 for electric energy and energy storage systems, the same as the House allowance.

Electric energy systems.—A total of $17,200,000 is recommended, which is the same as the House allowance. The recommendation includes funding for continued development of the Hawaiian deep underwater cable project.

Energy storage systems.—An amount of $25,700,000 is included for energy storage, the same as the House.

The recommendation provides $2,900,000 in physical and chemical storage for continued development of the Wisconsin superconducting magnetic energy storage project.

NUCLEAR FISSION

The Committee believes that nuclear fission remains an important option for meeting our nearer term electric energy requirements and for lessening the Nation's reliance on imported oil. The Committee continues to strongly support the nuclear fission program.

A total of $537,391,000 is provided for the nuclear fission reactor program, an increase of $14,400,000 over the budget request and $52,600,000 below the House allowance.

Converter reactor.—An amount of $71,783,000 is provided under the heading of converter reactor activities, this is $35,000,000 over the budget request and $11,000,000 less than the House allowance.

For high temperature reactor technology, $35,000,000 is recommended. The development of this technology has been supported in the past because of its potential to serve special market areas and its potential advantages over the current light water reactor systems. Although the administration proposes to terminate the program, the Committee believes that it is premature to close out this option at the present time without further research and development. In view of the need for a long and costly development program, however, the Committee believes it is important for the private sector to evidence a stronger commitment to the commercial application of the technology.

Funding of $4,000,000 for light water reactor systems and $27,000,000 for Three Mile Island activities is recommended by the Committee, this is the same as the budget request and $11,000,000 below the House allowance.

For advanced reactor systems, the fiscal year 1983 budget request proposed to transfer funding for reduced-enrichment research and test reactor (RERTR) program to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Committee considers this type of research to be a responsibility of the Department of Energy. Therefore, the funding request has been transferred from the State, Justice, Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee to the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee. The Committee recommends $4,800,000 for this activity, the same as the House and the budget request.

Commercial nuclear waste.—The Committee recommends $58,089,000 for the commercial nuclear waste R. & D. effort, which is $6,000,000 below the House and $7,000,000 lower than the budget request. Although the budget request for this program is a reduction of $133,293,000 from the fiscal year 1982 level, most of the nuclear waste program has been shifted to the new nuclear waste disposal fund. This fund is intended to provide an additional $185,000,000 for waste disposal activities to be financed from fees paid by electric utilities which generate nuclear power. Therefore, the total funds available for commercial nuclear waste activities in fiscal year 1983 represents an increase of nearly 25 percent over the levels of funding in 1982. The Committee believes that the subseabed disposal program should be funded at no less than the fiscal 1982 level and in such a way as to maintain U.S. leadership in this international research effort.

Remedial action.—A total of $61,900,000 is provided for remedial action programs, this is $3,800,000 below the budget request and $7,200,000 above the House allowance.

For remedial action at inactive uranium mill tailing sites, the Committee includes $22,800,000, the same as the budget request and $10,000,000 above the House allowance. Restoration of the budget request will allow continuation of important ongoing remedial action activities.

The Committee again calls attention to a problem potentially affecting residents in the vicinity of Edgemont, S. Dak., due to uranium mill tailings placed as fill material off-site of the TVA mill.

The Committee concurs with the conference report on H.R. 2330, the NRC authorization bill, which directs DOE to proceed expeditiously with the Edgemont project, basing its plans for remedial action on the radiological monitoring and engineering assessments conducted by the NRC in conjunction with the State of South Dakota.

It is the Committee's expectation that removal of these off-site materials during the 1983 construction season, at a time when TVA is prepared to receive such materials, will serve to minimize Federal expenditures for the remedial action project and, in addition, will serve to minimize any further disruption to the Edgemont community. Therefore, of the funds appropriated for the remedial action program at uranium mill tailings sites, the Committee directs the Secretary to make available whatever funds are necessary up to $1,000,000 to proceed with the remedial action work at off-site locations in the vicinity of the TVA mill site.

For the West Valley demonstration project, the Committee recommends $15,400,000, the same as the budget request and $1,000,000 more than the House allowance.

For management of radioactivity-contaminated facilities, the Committee includes $8,900,000, a reduction of $3,800,000 below the request. This $3,800,000 for decommissioning operations at the Mound facility is provided in the atomic energy defense activities account.

Advanced nuclear systems.—The Committee includes $30,626,000 for space and terrestrial applications, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

Breeder reactor systems.—The Committee recommends $324,993,000 under breeder reactor systems, the same as the budget request and $44,300,000 below the House allowance.

The Committee supports the administration's proposal for restructuring the LMFBR base program. Within the necessary budget constraints, it is vital that the resources of the base program be used most efficiently and effectively. This implies a consolidation and refocusing of program on the highest priority remaining LMFBR technical issues, making maximum use of strongest technical expertise and facilities, relying on existing facilities where they are adequate for program R. & D. needs and, possibly, some deemphasis of areas where the major technical issues have been largely resolved. Further, it is the feeling of the Committee that simple proportional cuts in all elements of the base program are inappropriate since this would nullify the efforts of the administration to most efficiently and effectively address the remaining key LMFBR technical issues.

Specifically, the Committee supports the administration's efforts to focus the base program more directly on (1) resolving the key safety and licensing issues and in developing inherently safe design features, and (2) development and testing of major LMFBR components, such as steam generators and sodium pumps, to demonstrate reliability for large

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
V. Technical Information Center				
Operating expenses..........................	14,526,000	8,553,000	8,553,000	14,553,000
Capital equipment...........................	1,300,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
Subtotal, Technical Information Center...........	15,826,000	8,903,000	8,903,000	14,903,000
VI. In-house energy management				
Operating expenses..........................	3,900,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Construction:				
83-A-601 Mods for energy Mgmt., various locations.....................	---	7,500,000	7,500,000	13,500,000
82-A-601 Energy modifications, var locations.	14,100,000	---	---	---
82-A-603 LASL Hot water distribution.........	2,100,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
81-A-602 Monitoring & control sys,y-12,or,Ten	2,500,000	---	---	---

12-313 O - 82 - 4

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
80-DA-6 Fuel Conver. Pantex	1,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	19,700,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	15,500,000
Subtotal, In-house energy management	23,600,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	16,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(3,900,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)
(Construction)	(19,700,000)	(9,500,000)	(9,500,000)	(15,500,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
VII. Plant engineering and design				
Construction:				
82-C-601 Plant engineering and design........	700,000	---	---	---
	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------
Total, Supporting research and tech. analysis....	334,568,000	349,994,000	346,594,000	365,900,000
(Operating expenses)............................	(263,278,000)	(284,588,000)	(284,588,000)	(291,994,000)
(Capital equipment)............................	(17,690,000)	(18,506,000)	(18,506,000)	(18,506,000)
(Construction)............................	(53,600,000)	(46,900,000)	(43,500,000)	(55,400,000)
SUBTOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT......	2,227,160,000	1,568,171,000	1,863,614,000	1,827,648,000
(Operating expenses)..................................	(1,853,745,000)	(1,350,715,000)	(1,575,258,000)	(1,577,992,000)
(Capital equipment)................................	(131,085,000)	(103,256,000)	(103,756,000)	(104,456,000)
(Construction)................................	(242,330,000)	(114,200,000)	(184,600,000)	(145,200,000)
Adjustments:				
Transfer from SWPA - OE - CS..........................	-9,000,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
FY 81 Deferrals				
Operating expenses	-105,688,000	---	---	---
Construction	-36,647,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, FY 81 Deferrals	-142,335,000	---	---	---
FY 1982 deferrals carried forward - OE	---	---	-4,000,000	---
Unobligated balances carried forward - OE	---	---	-30,000,000	---
Total, Adjustments	-151,335,000	---	-34,000,000	---
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,075,825,000	1,568,171,000	1,829,614,000	1,827,648,000
(Operating expenses)	(1,739,057,000)	(1,350,715,000)	(1,541,258,000)	(1,577,992,000)
(Capital equipment)	(131,085,000)	(103,256,000)	(103,756,000)	(104,456,000)
(Construction)	(205,683,000)	(114,200,000)	(184,600,000)	(145,200,000)

plant applications. In addition, the Committee is concerned that LMFBR costs could be a block to commercialization and supports the administration's continuing efforts to focus the base program on technology developments that have the potential of reducing the costs of LMFBR plants.

The Committee recognizes that the fiscal year 1983 constrained budget must inevitably impact on some of the program elements. The administration's budget proposals are seen as an effective response to the constrained budget resulting in an optimum distribution of the base program resources without dismantling any of the elements of base program.

The Committee agrees with the general thrust of the administration's program adjustments. With the inclusion of all breeder construction projects, the overall reduction in breeder activities from fiscal year 1982 levels totals less than 10 percent. The impact within the breeder base program, however, is an area of concern to the Committee. Accordingly, the Committee expects the Department to do everything possible to minimize the disruption to ongoing activities within the program. The recommendation includes $4,000,000 for supporting fuel cycle technology incident to FMEF objectives.

No funds are available from this or any other account for general nuclear information activities.

For the Clinch River breeder reactor project, the Committee recommendation is discussed in the nuclear fuel cycle activities account as proposed by the House.

Nuclear fuel cycle R. & D.—The Committee recommendation for nuclear fuel cycle R. & D. activities is discussed in the recommendation for the nuclear fuel cycle activities account.

ENVIRONMENT

The recommendation provides $189,540,000 for environment programs, which is $20,700,000 over the budget request and $8,000,000 above the House allowance.

Environment, safety, and health programs.—A total of $2,000,000 is restored to the budget request to support the Department's efforts to strengthen and upgrade nuclear safety programs.

Biological and environmental research.—The Committee provides $146,900,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the House and $20,000,000 more than the budget request.

MAGNETIC FUSION

The Committee recommendation provides $462,800,000 for magnetic fusion energy research and development, an increase of $18,700,000 over the budget request and $6,300,000 below the House allowance. From the total recommendation, $367,600,000 is included for operating expenses as requested in the budget, this is an increase of $66,273,000 over fiscal year 1982 levels. While there is a reduction in fusion construction activity from fiscal year 1982 funding, the lower request is due to the completion of project 76–5–A, the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor at Princeton University.

Confinement systems.—The Committee recommends $217,300,000 for confinement systems, a $14,500,000 increase over the budget request and $6,500,000 over the House. Additional funds are provided for operating expenses at the Mirror Fusion Test Facility (MFTF), the Advanced Toroidal Facility, and the EBT program. For project 80–MF–3, EBT proof of principal, the recommendation provides $5,500,000 to maintain the project while its need and impact on the program is being assessed by the Magnetic Fusion Advisory Committee and the Department.

Development and technology.—A total of $84,000,000 is recommended for these activities, the same as the House and the budget request.

Applied plasma physics.—The Committee recommendation includes $79,500,000 for the applied plasma physics area, which is $2,200,000 over the budget request and House allowance. The recommendation includes $2,200,000 of additional funding for the modifications and upgrade of the ZT–40 device at the Los Alamos National lab. The Committee provides $1,500,000 to continue stellarator research at the Univesity of Wisconsin, and to proceed with design of stellarator experiments to insure that the potential of this concept can be evaluated in a timely and cost-effective manner.

Planning and projects.—The Committee recommends $78,000,000, which is $2,000,000 over the budget request and $15,000,000 below the House allowance. An increase of $2,000,000, the same as the House allowance, is provided for project 78–3–8, the Fusion Materials Irradiation Test Facility, to maintain a minimum level of effort in fiscal year 1983.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The Committee recommends a total of $365,900,000 for these activities, an increase of $15,906,000 over the budget request and $19,306,000 more than the House allowance.

Basic energy sciences.—The Committee recommendation provides $282,850,000 for basic energy sciences, the same amount as the House allowance and the budget request. This represents a $41,667,000 increase over fiscal year 1982 levels and provides for a strong basic research program.

Other research and analysis.—For university research support, the recommendation includes $7,100,000, an increase of $2,000,000 over the budget request to continue education and training activities and to maintain the current level of support for the University Reactor Fuel Assistance program.

Project 81–E–325, Energy technology lab.—The Committee recommends that the construction of the technology transfer center, the third portion of the energy technology lab, should begin without further delay.

NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1982	$2,049,627,000
Budget estimate, 1983	2,463,821,000
House allowance	2,418,121,000
Committee recommendation	2,348,321,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−115,500,000
House allowance	−69,800,000

REVENUES APPLIED

Revenues applied, 1982	−$1,830,200,000
Budget estimate, 1983	−1,967,046,000
House allowance	−2,307,700,000
Committee recommendation	−2,307,700,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+340,654,000
House allowance	

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1982	$219,427,000
Budget estimate, 1983	496,775,000
House allowance	110,421,000
Committee recommendation	40,621,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−456,154,000
House allowance	−69,800,000

As proposed by the House, the Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1983 includes a new appropriation account that consolidates the existing uranium supply and enrichment activities account, the Clinch River breeder reactor project, and the nuclear waste disposal fund account and nuclear fuel cycle R. & D. activities proposed in the fiscal year 1983 budget, into a new nuclear fuel cycle activities account.

The primary purpose of the new appropriation structure is to bring together those parts of the nuclear fuel cycle from which revenues or private sector contributions are currently or may in the future be derived. The appropriation would provide for revenues generated by the provision of services or from cooperative technology development and demonstration activities to be used to offset the costs of providing those services and to pay or repay certain of the research, development, and demonstration costs of semi-commerical and commercial type activities related to the nuclear fuel cycle. Each activity or project is provided with a separate appropriation with provision for appropriate revenue credits where applicable, so as to maintain continuing fiscal accountability. However, excess revenues over current obligations are credited to the nuclear fuel cycle activities account so as to reduce annual appropriation requirements to the amounts actually needed to carry out these activities at the approved levels specifically approved by law.

Revenues.—The sources of revenues estimated to be available and included in this appropriation in fiscal year 1983 are as follows:

Uranium enrichment services	$2,007,700,000
Nuclear waste disposal fees	300,000,000
Total	2,307,700,000

The revised appropriation language provides authority for continuity of program operations at the recommended level during the fiscal year. Because revenue collections fluctuate during the year and peak toward the end of the year, the program requires obligational authority at various times during the fiscal year in addition to that available from receipts during the year and the final appropriation amount. The final appropriation of $40,621,000 reflects the estimated net new budget authority to be provided for this account as of the end of this fiscal year.

Expenditures.—The activities to be funded from this appropriation include the following:

Uranium supply and enrichment activities	$1,919,046,000
Clinch River breeder reactor project	195,000,000
Nuclear fuel cycle R. & D	49,275,000
Nuclear waste disposal activities	185,000,000
Total	2,348,321,000

URANIUM ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

This appropriation provides for expenses of the Department of Energy in connection with operating expenses, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other related incidental expenses necessary for uranium supply and enrichment activities. In this account, the revenues received from the enrichment of uranium are retained and used to offset costs incurred by the Department in providing uranium enrichment and other services.

The Committee recommends $1,919,046,000 for uranium supply and enrichment activities, this is $30,050,000 below the House allowance and $48,000,000 lower than the budget request.

Gaseous diffusion program.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,219,250,000, the same as the budget request and $14,950,000 over the House allowance. At present, the Department enriches uranium for its domestic and foreign customers at three gaseous diffusion enrichment plants. The Department is nearing completion of a 10-year, $1.5 billion program to improve efficiency at the existing plants, and to increase their production capacity to meet potential future demand. In recent years, the plants have been operating at only about 40 percent of capacity while adequately providing for all domestic and foreign requirements.

Due to the low level of operations and to the long-term power contracts, the Department is obligated to pay capacity charges for power which is not delivered or used. The Committee again notes with concern the inclusion of a large amount, $151,000,000, in the 1983 budget request for demand payments for power not purchased under the contracts with three power supplies.

The Committee expects the Department to aggressively pursue such steps as are necessary to increase production to utilize the power under contract and/or renegotiate the power contracts.

Gas centrifuge program.—The Committee recommends $629,500,000 for the gas centrifuge program, a reduction of $65,000,000 below the House and $78,000,000 below the budget request.

For operating expenses, the recommendation of $96,200,000 is $10,000,000 over the House allowance and budget request. The Committee has provided additional funding to support accelerated research and related activities aimed at expediting the development of advanced gas centrifuge technology. The advanced gas centrifuge program is designed to decrease GCEP separative work costs by development of a progression of three centrifuge machine designs to replace the less-efficient baseline GCEP machines. The Committee believes that the Department should place increased emphasis on advanced machine development and should continue to place more responsibility upon industry for development of baseline and advance gas centrifuge technology.

For project 76–8–G, enriched uranium production facilities (GCEP), Portsmouth, Ohio, the Committee recommends $525,000,000 in lieu of $613,000,000 as requested in the budget request and $600,000,000 in the House allowance.

As the House report has indicated, two recent reports, one by the General Accounting Office (GAO) and another by the Congressional Research Service (CRS), question and cast serious doubt on the need to continue construction of the GCEP facility. This uncertainty is based on an extensive analysis of future demand for DOE enrichment services, the emergence of foreign uranium enrichment capacity, unit price, and the development of an advanced isotope separation technology (AIS).

The design of GCEP was initiated in fiscal year 1975 and construction began in fiscal year 1979. The original design calls for eight process buildings with an expected cost of at least $7,000,000,000 (in 1983 dollars). At the end of fiscal year 1982, DOE has spent approximately $1,200,000,000 on design and construction of the plant. Most of these funds have been spent on (1) partial construction of two of the eight planned centrifuge machine process buildings, (2) partial or complete construction of many other facilities which will support the entire plant of all eight buildings and (3) site preparation for all eight process buildings.

When Congress authorized construction of GCEP in 1975, demand for U.S. enrichment services was expected to exceed the increased capacity of improved gaseous diffusion plants by the early 1980's. With the dramatic decline in projections for nuclear powerplants, it appears clear, and both the GAO and CRS studies conclude, that there is sufficient U.S. enrichment capacity without GCEP to satisfy projected demand for enrichment services through the year 2000 or beyond. There is also a worldwide surplus of uranium enrichment capacity. As noted earlier, the existing three diffusion plants are operating at less than half of their capacity. Moreover, as CRS indicates, DOE could reduce the need for enrichment capacity further by increasing the operating tails assay at the diffusion plants. In addition, any projected demand could be partially met by increased preproduction and stockpiling of enriched uranium. In summary, the GCEP plant must be viewed as replacement capacity for the diffusion plants which are now being renovated. And even with a sharp reversal in the outlook for nuclear power, new enrichment capacity can be brought on line faster than new nuclear powerplants.

The current proposal for continuing GCEP construction is based on the expectation that the centrifuge plant will reduce long-range costs of enrichment services primarily due to lower power operating expenses. Although the operating costs will probably be substantially lower for gas centrifuges as compared to diffusion plants, this does not take into account the large capital cost of GCEP and the potentially higher maintenance costs. The capital costs of GCEP are not being recovered and, as a matter of fact, the capital costs of the diffusion plants are only partially recovered.

In view of these considerations, the GAO has determined that because demand has fallen off so sharply, building GCEP will no longer provide lower enrichment prices. CRS similarly found that in the low enrichment scenarios, now acknowledged by DOE, it is questionable whether completion of GCEP will reduce the total cost of producing enriched uranium. More importantly, the Department's cost analysis tends to ignore the impact of successful development of AIS, which could make both gaseous diffusion and GCEP economically obsolete.

The Committee carefully considered the need for GCEP from various perspectives, and evaluated analyses from the DOE, the GAO, the CRS, and private enrichment interests. Based on the evidence provided to the Committee and for the reasons cited above, the Committee believes that the GCEP project should be continued only under the following guidelines:

—DOE construction efforts shall be strictly limited to process buildings 1 and 2;

—No funds are provided in fiscal year 1983 for any activities relating to process buildings 3 thru 8 without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations;

—DOE should, with the additional funds recommended, accelerate development of advance isotope separation technology;

—DOE should, with the additional funds recommended, accelerate development of advanced gas centrifuge technology;

—DOE is directed to develop and submit to Congress a plan to operate the U.S. uranium enrichment program based on an assumption of no net outlays (revenues equal expenditures) on an annual basis; and

—DOE is directed to conduct a formal study with industry and provide recommendations which could lead to the transfer of the U.S. uranium enrichment business to the private sector.

Advanced isotope separation technology.—The Committee recommends $62,196,000 for advanced isotope separation enrichment technology, $28,000,000 above the budget request and $20,000,000 more than the House.

Although in a relative early stage of development, the Department believes this process can reduce the costs of enriching uranium substantially below the costs of either of the other two enriching technologies—gaseous diffusion and gas centrifuge. The recommendation provides for accelerated development of this credible, low-cost alternative for uranium enrichment production. This increase will maintain an option for an early process demonstration in the late 1980's.

Uranium resource assessment.—The recommendation provides $5,000,000 for fiscal year 1983, the same as the House and $2,000,000 over the budget request.

Revenues.—As proposed by the House, the Committee recommendation provides for retention and utilization of the $65,654,000 revenues rather than not applying them, as proposed in the budget. In addition, $25,000,000 in revenues proposed to be applied to this account would be retained to offset costs in departmental administration, as has been done in prior years.

CLINCH RIVER REACTOR DEMONSTRATION

The Committee recommendation provides $195,000,000 of Federal funding for the Clinch River breeder reactor project. This is approximately the fiscal year 1982 level and $32,250,000 lower than the House allowance.

In 1970, Congress authorized the Department (AEC) to enter into a cooperative arrangement with private industry to build and operate the first intermediate scale (375MWe) breeder demonstration plant. The Clinch River project is designed as the first step in a process to be followed by another larger demonstration plant which ultimately will lead to commercial use of the breeder technology.

As originally authorized, the total cost of the project was estimated at about $600,000,000 with contributions from utilities and reactor manufacturers of $268,000,000. Although the cost of the project has increased to an estimated $3,600,000,000 or more, the amount of private funding or contributions has remained at the same level. Over $130,000,000 of the proposed contributions from the private participants remain available under the original cooperative arrangement.

The Committee is aware of the growing controversy even within the scientific community which surrounds this project. Aside from this ongoing debate, the Committee is concerned that the private sector has not evidenced a stronger financial commitment to the project.

Accordingly, the recommendation provides adequate Federal funding for the project in fiscal year 1983, assuming the potential for additional private contributions under the existing cooperative arrangement. Further, the Committee urges the Department to vigorously explore proposals that would reduce future Federal budget requirements and secure the greatest possible participation from the private sector.

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL ACTIVITIES

The administration proposed a new account for nuclear waste disposal activities. To fund these activities, an amendment to the budget request proposed $185,000,000 in borrowing authority. Although providing $185,000,000 in new budget authority, the Committee has incorporated this program, and the estimated revenues from it, into the nuclear fuel cycle activities account.

The Committee is concerned with the lack of specificity and the potential for duplication of effort in the Department's justification for these activities. Because a broader program is in the early stages of development and legislation is pending in the Congress, the recommendation includes the full level of support requested in the administration's budget.

Pending enactment of a comprehensive nuclear waste policy, the Committee expects the Department of Energy and other Federal agencies with jurisdictional responsibilities to take steps necessary to insure, in consultation with an involved State, that all technical issues are properly addressed before decisions are made for siting a permanent geologic nuclear waste repository. This is to include the phases of study specified in the National Plan for Siting High-Level Radioactive Waste Repositories and Environmental Assessment.

NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE R. & D.

The Committee recommends $49,275,000 for nuclear fuel cycle research and development activities, $7,500,000 below the House and $10,000,000 lower than the budget request.

In March 1981, the President indicated that although he supports reprocessing, he does "not believe it would be appropriate for the Federal Government to acquire the Barnwell plant or to finance operation of any of its facilities."

The administration fiscal 1983 budget proposes to continue activities for the Barnwell facility for one more year prior to the possible assumption of the facility by a commercial enterprise.

Even with the spending of $64,500,000 in Federal funds over the last 5 years in anticipation of private operation, one of the plant owners is proceeding to take a tax write-off and both owners indicate no intention to operate the facility. Therefore, the Committee provides no funding for the Barnwell program in fiscal year 1983.

The Committee recommendation includes $6,000,000, the same as the budget request, for interim storage technology of which not less than $3,500,000 is for the monitored retrievable storage (MRS) program.

The objective of the MRS program is to define and engineer long-term storage concepts for spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste. These concepts would apply in the event that geologic repositories are not available in time to accommodate the nuclear wastes from reprocessing or spent fuel generated by U.S. power reactors. The fiscal year 1983 program should be directed toward studies and engineering conceptual designs of MRS facilities. These facilities would be stand-alone facilities capable of long-term underground isolation of up to

50,000 metric tons of fuel or waste. Options include tunnel-rack storage and vaults. Fiscal year 1983 activities shall be directed toward further technical definition and engineering of concepts and conceptual development of selected options. Studies shall be completed to investigate licensing requirements, including radiation-monitoring and heat-removal systems. During fiscal year 1983, a reference facility conceptual design shall be completed to support a schedule 44 form for submittal to Congress that shall include a siting recommendation, environmental assessment, and design concept for a full-scale MRS facility, including cost estimates and a detailed project schedule.

Within the funds provided, $3,000,000 is included for thorium fuel cycle research.

The following table shows the Committee recommendation for each program or activity.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE ACTIVITIES				
I. Uranium Enrichment Activities				
A. Uranium enrichment				
1. Gaseous diffusion program				
Operating expenses..............................	935,818,000	1,116,500,000	1,116,500,000	1,116,500,000
Capital equipment..............................	23,600,000	21,600,000	21,600,000	21,600,000
Construction:				
83-N-401 Rep. of elec. circuit breaker Gas dif. plant, Portsmouth, Ohio..............	---	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
83-N-402 Compli. with toxic sub. Control act, gas dif. plants..................	---	6,000,000	1,000,000	6,000,000
83-N-403 UF6 cylinders storage Yards, gas. dif. plants......................	15,150,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-N-404 GPP gas. dif. plants	---	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
83-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase II, gas. dif. plant	---	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
82-R-412 Coolingtower mods	8,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
82-R-413 IMP UF6 containment	7,100,000	20,900,000	20,900,000	20,900,000
82-R-415 Fire alarm sys rep	4,700,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
82-R-416 Env/safety mods	---	5,000,000	---	5,000,000
81-R-506 Environmental protection and safety improvements, Phase I GDP's	---	4,950,000	---	4,950,000
Prior year projects	34,700,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	69,650,000	81,150,000	66,200,000	81,150,000
Plant and capital equipment	93,250,000	102,750,000	87,800,000	102,750,000
Subtotal, Gaseous diffusion Program	1,029,068,000	1,219,250,000	1,204,300,000	1,219,250,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
2. Gas Centrifuge Program				
Operating expenses	81,200,000	86,200,000	86,200,000	96,200,000
Capital equipment	3,600,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
Construction:				
82-R-418 Advanced test facility	2,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
76-8-G Enriched Uranium production facility, Portsmouth, OH	588,000,000	613,000,000	600,000,000	525,000,000
Prior year projects	-84,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	590,416,000	617,500,000	604,500,000	529,500,000
Subtotal, Gas Centrifuge program	675,216,000	707,500,000	694,500,000	629,500,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
3. Program direction - OE........................	3,019,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------
Subtotal, Uranium enrichment activities..........	1,707,303,000	1,929,850,000	1,901,900,000	1,851,850,000
(Operating expenses)............................	(1,020,037,000)	(1,205,800,000)	(1,205,800,000)	(1,215,800,000)
(Capital equipment)............................	(27,200,000)	(25,400,000)	(25,400,000)	(25,400,000)
(Construction)............................	(660,066,000)	(698,650,000)	(670,700,000)	(610,650,000)
B. Advanced isotope separation technology				
1. Advanced isotope separation technology				
Operating expenses............................	79,087,000	29,746,000	29,746,000	49,746,000
Capital equipment.............................	5,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Construction:				
83-N-404 GPP.................................	---	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
82-N-402 General plant projects..............	650,000	---	---	---
83-N-450 Development module..................	---	---	8,000,000	8,000,000
Subtotal, Construction.......................	650,000	1,400,000	9,400,000	9,400,000
Subtotal, Advanced isotope separation technology.	85,237,000	33,646,000	41,646,000	61,646,000
2. Program direction - OE....................	474,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
Subtotal, Advanced isotope separation tech.......	85,711,000	34,196,000	42,196,000	62,196,000
(Operating expenses).........................	(79,561,000)	(30,296,000)	(30,296,000)	(50,296,000)
(Capital equipment).........................	(5,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)
(Construction)............................	(650,000)	(1,400,000)	(9,400,000)	(9,400,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Uranium resource assessment				
1. Assessment program				
Operating expenses	5,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Capital equipment	200,000	---	---	---
Construction:				
83-N-404 GPP, Grand Junction	100,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Assessment Program	5,800,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
2. Program direction - OE	4,179,000	---	2,000,000	2,000,000
Subtotal, Uranium resource assessment	9,979,000	3,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(Operating expenses)	(9,679,000)	(3,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)
(Capital equipment)	(200,000)	---	---	---
(Construction)	(100,000)	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES:				
Operating expenses	1,109,277,000	1,239,096,000	1,241,096,000	1,271,096,000
Capital equipment	32,900,000	27,900,000	27,900,000	27,900,000
Construction	660,816,000	700,050,000	680,100,000	620,050,000
Subtotal	1,802,993,000	1,967,046,000	1,949,096,000	1,919,046,000
Uranium Enrichment Revenues:				
Gross revenues	-1,830,200,000	-2,032,700,000	-2,007,700,000	-2,007,700,000
Revenues applied to program	1,802,993,000	1,967,046,000	1,949,096,000	1,919,046,000
Unapplied revenues	---	65,654,000	---	---
Uranium Enrichment, net revenue carry over to FY 1984	-27,207,000	---	-58,604,000	-88,654,000
II. Fuel Cycle Demonstration Activities				
Clinch River Breeder Reactor demonstration - OE	193,922,000	252,500,000	227,250,000	195,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Nuclear Waste Disposal Activities				
A. Nuclear waste disposal				
1. Operating expenses:				
Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation..............	---	73,250,000	73,250,000	73,250,000
Basalt Waste Isolation Project.................	---	49,700,000	49,700,000	49,700,000
Nevada Nuclear Waste Storage Investigations...	---	56,700,000	56,700,000	56,700,000
2. Capital Equipment...........................	---	5,350,000	5,350,000	5,350,000
TOTAL, Nuclear waste disposal (requested as "Borrowing Authority")...	---	185,000,000	185,000,000	185,000,000
B. Nuclear waste revenues:				
Gross revenues.................................	---	-300,000,000	-300,000,000	-300,000,000
Revenues applied to program....................	---	---	185,000,000	185,000,000
Unapplied revenues.............................	---	300,000,000	---	---
Nuclear waste disposal, net revenue carryover to FY84.	---	---	-115,000,000	-115,000,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1982	$423,892,000
Budget estimate, 1983	483,670,000
House allowance	483,120,000
Committee recommendation	482,120,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−1,550,000
House allowance	−1,000,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1982	$118,810,000
Budget estimate, 1983	117,300,000
House allowance	118,085,000
Committee recommendation	125,085,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+7,785,000
House allowance	+7,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $607,205,000 for General Science and Research Activities.

The appropriation recommended for Operating Expenses, General Science and Research Activities provides for fundamental research in Life Sciences and Biomedical Applications, High Energy Physics, and Nuclear Physics.

The budget request for general science and research is $600,970,000, an increase of $58,268,000 over the fiscal year 1982 appropriation. The Committee supports this significant increase in funding and believes it represents continuing strong support for the highest priority research activities.

Nuclear medicine applications.—The Committee is concerned with the size of reductions in nuclear medicine application activities. An amount of $21,500,000 is recommended to continue the most critical activities, the same as the House and $3,000,000 over the budget request.

High energy physics.—The Committee recommends $432,235,000 for high energy physics, which is $19,000,000 more than the House allowance and $67,835,000 above the fiscal year 1982 level.

For the Intersecting Storage Accelerator (ISABELLE), project 78–10–B, the Department did not request construction funding because the focus of the ISABELLE effort in fiscal year 1983 will be on an R. & D. effort for superconducting magnets and on studies of alternatives which might have lower costs. Although the technical problems with the design of an acceptable superconducting magnet have apparently now been solved by the adoption of the two-layer cable design, substantial R. & D. is required to proceed from these successful R. & D. magnets to a fully engineered production prototype magnet and to develop and demonstrate a cost-effective fabrication capability. Nevertheless, the Committee provides $10,000,000 for ISABELLE in construction funds to preserve the construction option and to retain a minimal technical capability. Funds are provided for further R. & D. and for studies designed to develop a lower-cost project.

The following table shows the Committee's recommendations by program for new (budget) obligational authority in comparison to the current year, the budget estimate, and House allowance.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Nuclear fuel cycle R&D				
A. Spent fuel technology				
Operating expenses	5,872,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000
Capital equipment	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Subtotal, Spent fuel technology	6,822,000	6,900,000	6,900,000	6,900,000
B. Fuel recycle R&D				
Operating expenses	33,400,000	32,500,000	30,000,000	22,500,000
Capital equipment	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000	3,100,000
Subtotal, Fuel recycle R&D	36,500,000	35,600,000	33,100,000	25,600,000
C. Waste treatment R&D				
Operating expenses	5,265,000	13,225,000	13,225,000	13,225,000
Capital equipment	1,960,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
83-N-335 General plant projects	---	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
82-N-315 General plant projects	1,100,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	1,100,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, Waste treatment R&D	8,325,000	15,625,000	15,625,000	15,625,000
D. Program direction - OE	1,065,000	1,150,000	1,150,000	1,150,000
Subtotal, Nuclear fuel cycle R&D	52,712,000	59,275,000	56,775,000	49,275,000
(Operating expenses)	(45,552,000)	(52,775,000)	(50,275,000)	(42,775,000)
(Capital equipment)	(6,060,000)	(5,300,000)	(5,300,000)	(5,300,000)
(Construction)	(1,100,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
TOTAL, NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE ACTIVITIES:				
Operating expenses	1,348,751,000	1,729,371,000	1,703,621,000	1,693,871,000
Capital equipment	38,960,000	33,200,000	33,200,000	33,200,000
Construction	661,916,000	701,250,000	681,300,000	621,250,000
Subtotal	2,049,627,000	2,463,821,000	2,418,121,000	2,348,321,000
Gross revenues	-1,830,200,000	-2,332,700,000	-2,307,700,000	-2,307,700,000
Unapplied revenues	---	365,654,000	---	---
Fuel Cycle Net	219,427,000	496,775,000	110,421,000	40,621,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH				
I. Life sciences research and nuclear medicine apps				
A. General life sciences				
Operating expenses	26,400,000	18,820,000	23,820,000	18,820,000
Capital equipment	2,000,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
Subtotal, General life science	28,400,000	20,520,000	25,520,000	20,520,000
B. Nuclear medicine applications				
Operating expenses	18,986,000	18,500,000	21,500,000	21,500,000
Subtotal, Life sciences research	47,386,000	39,020,000	47,020,000	42,020,000
(Operating expenses)	(45,386,000)	(37,320,000)	(45,320,000)	(40,320,000)
(Capital equipment)	(2,000,000)	(1,700,000)	(1,700,000)	(1,700,000)

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. High energy physics				
A. Physics research				
Operating expenses	78,000,000	93,000,000	88,350,000	93,000,000
B. Facility operations				
Operating expenses	124,400,000	157,300,000	149,435,000	157,300,000
Capital equipment	37,800,000	44,000,000	42,085,000	42,085,000
Construction:				
83-E-204 AIP	---	8,000,000	7,000,000	8,000,000
83-E-205 GPP	---	6,500,000	5,500,000	6,500,000
82-E-204 General plant projects	6,000,000	---	---	---
82-E-205 Acc Improv. mods	7,000,000	---	---	---
82-E-206 Tevatron II	6,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-E-218 Tevatron I	14,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
79-9-B Energy saver, fermi national lab Batavia IL	6,500,000	---	---	---
78-10-B Intersecting storage accelerator (Isabelle) Brookhaven national lab, NY	15,000,000	---	5,000,000	10,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	54,500,000	50,500,000	53,500,000	60,500,000
Subtotal, Facility operations	216,700,000	251,800,000	245,020,000	259,885,000
C. High energy technology				
Operating expenses	66,800,000	80,700,000	76,665,000	76,150,000

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1982	$3,676,534,000
Budget estimate, 1983	4,524,040,000
House allowance	4,454,740,000
Committee recommendation	4,379,450,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−144,590,000
House allowance	−75,290,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1982	$1,078,565,000
Budget estimate, 1983	1,401,641,000
House allowance	1,306,841,000
Committee recommendation	1,328,041,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−73,600,000
House allowance	+21,200,000

The Committee recommends a total appropriation of $5,707,491,000 for atomic energy defense activities.

The appropriation recommended for atomic energy defense activities supports inertial confinement fusion, naval reactors development, the research, development, testing, production and stockpile maintenance for nuclear weapons, verification and control technology, special materials production, defense waste management and nuclear materials security and safeguards.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

The Committee recommends substantial increases in spending for the research, development, testing, production and surveillance of nuclear weapons in order to meet defense requirements. The budget includes funds for the production of nine nuclear weapons systems—the B61–3 and –4 bombs, the W70–3 warhead for the Lance missile, the W76 warhead for the Trident, the W78 warhead for the Minuteman II, the W79 warhead for the artillery fired atomic projectile, the W80–1 warhead for the air launched cruise missile, the B83 modern strategic bomb, the W84 warhead for the ground launched cruise missile, and the W85 Pershing II missile warheads.

Efforts are also underway in anticipation of future production of a number of additional nuclear warheads and bombs.

The Committee shares the concerns expressed by the House in regard to weapon system builds and retirements. The Committee believes that additional attention should be given by the National Security Council, the Departments of Defense and Energy, and the cognizant authorizing committees to the size of the proposed builds for several of the new systems proposed for production in the 1983–87 timeframe. Some build levels appear excessive in relation to military capabilities and requirements, as well as realistic assessments of deployment requirements in the current world political climate. The Committee also believes that additional attention is required on the retirement program, particularly for those systems that would alleviate materials production requirements and those systems that are considered to be near or at the stage of obsolescence. Specifically, the Committee requests a joint DOD–DOE report not later than January 31, 1983, providing specific justification of the build levels for all eight systems included in the 1983 program. The report should include a review and justification of the retirement program, including specifically, plans for the W31, W33, W45, W48, B54, W66, and W71 systems.

The Committee is particularly concerned with delays in retirement of the W33, 8-inch artillery fired atomic projectile (AFAP) currently in the stockpile. The DOE and DOD have grave concerns about the safety and the military usefulness of this atomic projectile. Moreover, a large quantity of weapons grade material which can be recycled and used in newer weapons is presently tied up in these warheads. Because production is now proceeding on the W79, 8-inch AFAP, the replacement for the older W33, the Committee directs that the joint report include a schedule for DOD and DOE to retire and recycle in an orderly manner the W33 warhead.

The Committee also believes that far more attention is needed from senior DOD and DOE management on realistic scheduling of DOD and DOE development and production programs to avoid unnecessary costs. The Pershing II acceleration and the cruise missile are examples of unrealistic scheduling requiring expensive mid-course corrections. In this regard, the Committee believes that the Military Liaison Committee could play a far more effective role in matching capabilities and requirements more cost effectively.

The Committee recommendation for weapons activities totals $3,322,141,000 which is an increase of $365,808,000 over the fiscal 1982 appropriation. The funding level proposed is $86,000,000 below the House allowance.

Research and development.—The Committee recommends $737,300,000 for research and development activities, an increase of $7,200,000 over the budget request and $17,800,000 below the House allowance.

For operating expenses, the recommendation includes $641,600,000, the same as the House allowance and $8,000,000 below the budget request. The Committee agrees with the House provisions regarding the Los Alamos Meson Physics Facility and the S–1 computer project.

The Committee includes $2,000,000 within the funds provided for an energy security study to explore the energy requirements and vulnerabilities of the military and to consider a goal of energy self-sufficiency for military bases. The Committee expects the Department of Defense to cooperate with DOE in addressing this national security issue.

For plant and capital equipment, the Committee recommends $95,700,000, an increase of $15,700,000 over the budget request and $18,600,000 below the House allowance.

Project 82–D–144, simulation technology laboratory, the Committee provides $3,000,000 to continue design and to secure construction contracts for site preparation and utilities for this important facility.

Project 82–D–152, new detonator facility, the recommendation of $7,500,000, a reduction of $2,600,000 below the House, is adequate to execute a contract on the second phase of the facility and maintain the current completion schedule.

Project 82–D–153, Trituim facility, the Committee recommends $1,600,000 in lieu of the $2,600,000 proposed by the House. This amount of funding will complete the project in fiscal year 1983.

Project 83–D–122, Los Alamos Airport improvement, the Committee includes $3,100,000, the same as the House, for safety improvements to the Los Alamos Airport.

Project 83–D–199, buffer land acquisition, the Committee includes no funding for this lower priority item in accord with the budget request.

Inertial confinement fusion.—The Committee recommendation provides $152,750,000 for the inertial confinement fusion program, the same as the budget request.

For operating expenses, the recommendation includes $122,000,000, the same as the budget request and $18,000,000 below the House allowance. The Department is reevaluating and rescoping the program and the Committee believes it is prudent to allow this process to occur in an orderly manner.

For plant and capital equipment, the recommendation includes $30,750,000, the same as the budget request and $19,000,000 below the House.

The administration's budget contains $2,750,000 in construction funds for the pulsed power program (PBFA—71–D–101). An appropriation of $4,250,000 will avoid further delays in the completion of the project. The pulsed power program is a promising alternative to the NOVA (glass) program and should be funded accordingly.

Testing.—The Committee recommends $449,300,000 for testing activities, the same as the House and $12,400,000 below the budget request. The recommendation is $59,450,000 over the fiscal year 1982 level.

For operating expenses, the $415,000,000 provides for an increase of at least 200 man-years as requested by the administration. The Committee did reduce, however, the request by $8,500,000 to reflect an inflation rate in line with more recent administration forecasts and slightly reduced the large increase for common-use stores.

Production and surveillance.—The Committee recommendation provides for $1,929,500,000 for production, surveillance, and maintenance of nuclear weapons, which is $30,400,000 below the House allowance and represents a 21-percent increase over fiscal year 1982 levels.

For operating expenses, the recommendation provides $1,479,100,000, a reduction of $30,900,000 from the House and $200,917,000 above fiscal year 1982 levels. The Committee has not provided the total increase requested since production of two warheads is being completed, retirement workload is down substantially and the increases requested in stockpile evaluation, process development, and other costs appear disproportionate to actual growth in workload. The recommendation also reflects a lower escalation or inflation factor than requested, in accordance with the more recent administration projections ($85,500,000 rather than $115,700,000).

The Committee believes that with prudent management the recommended levels will be adequate to maintain production schedules for all system delivery requirements, modifications, and retirements as well as meeting essential needs in other areas.

The recommendation provides for several purchases of major equipment items, including funds to acquire two DC9 aircraft. The Committee expects the Department to submit a complete justification for these procurements and written verification from the Department of Defense that it is incapable of providing the airlift support required by DOE for these purposes. No funds are available for the acquisition of aircraft until the Committee on Appropriations has reviewed the additional material and approved the procurement.

For plant and capital equipment, the recommendation includes $450,400,000, an increase of $500,000 over the House allowance and $96,800,000 below the budget request. In construction, the Committee restores contingency funding for projects 82–D–106, 78–16–A, and 78–17–D which was reduced by the House. The recommendation provides the full budget request for the SM–2 warhead, the MX warhead, the cruise missile, the restoration program and the critical elements of the stockpile improvement project.

Project 83–D–134, low altitude defense systems (LoAD), the Committee agrees with the House in providing no funds in fiscal year 1983 for the Sentry warhead production capability. This action is consistent with the Senate Armed Services Committee proposed deferral of authorization for the LoAD warhead.

Project 81–D–115, MX warhead facilities, the Committee provides $60,000,000, the same as the House and the budget request. Obligation of this funding is contingent upon approval by the Committee on Appropriations and the Armed Services Committee in order to insure that expenditures on warhead production facilities are consistent with congressional action on the MX missile system.

Project 82–D–111, interactive graphics system, the budget request includes $12,000,000 to initiate construction of facilities and procurement of equipment to install a computer assisted design system in the production complex. It is unclear whether productivity improvements that may be possible in a mass production environment could be achieved in the relatively limited production mode of the nuclear weapons facilities. Due to the lower priority assigned to this project, the Committee recommends deletion of the funds proposed to initiate these activities.

Project 82–D–109, 155mm artillery fired atomic projectile (AFAP). Development of a new 155mm nuclear projectile began in 1969 with the Army stating a need for a modernized artillery shell to replace the deployed W48. Development of the W74 warhead began that year and continued until 1973 when the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy terminated the program due to excessive cost and the use of obsolete technology. Requests to reinitiate the 155mm development were denied by Congress in 1975 and 1976, but, in 1977, a new analysis of modernization requirements led to congressional authorization and appropriation of funds to reinitiate a research program.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Other capital equipment - CE	2,900,000	3,500,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
Subtotal, High energy physics	364,400,000	429,000,000	413,235,000	432,235,000
(Operating expenses)	(269,200,000)	(331,000,000)	(314,450,000)	(326,450,000)
(Capital equipment)	(40,700,000)	(47,500,000)	(45,285,000)	(45,285,000)
(Construction)	(54,500,000)	(50,500,000)	(53,500,000)	(60,500,000)
III. Nuclear physics				
A. Medium energy physics				
Operating expenses	50,600,000	53,100,000	59,100,000	53,100,000
Capital equipment	8,710,000	---	---	---
Construction:				
82-E-221 AIP	1,500,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
82-E-222 General plant projects..............	2,000,000	---	---	---
Subtotal Construction........................	3,500,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Medium energy physics..................	62,810,000	53,100,000	59,100,000	53,100,000
B. Heavy ion physics				
Operating expenses............................	41,814,000	39,700,000	41,700,000	39,700,000
Construction:.................................				
83-E-201 AIP................................	---	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
83-E-202 GPP................................	---	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
82-E-223 Argonne tandem acc sys - ATLAS......	4,000,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
80-GS-5 National superconducting lab Mich state univ (A-E & long-lead proc).......	4,500,000	---	---	---
Subtotal Construction........................	8,500,000	7,700,000	7,700,000	7,700,000
Subtotal, Heavy ion physics......................	50,314,000	47,400,000	49,400,000	47,400,000
C. Low energy physics				
Operating expenses...........................	12,257,000	12,400,000	12,400,000	12,400,000
D. Nuclear theory				
Operating expenses...........................	7,700,000	8,150,000	8,150,000	8,150,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
F. Capital equipment - CE	800,000	9,900,000	9,900,000	9,900,000
Subtotal, Nuclear physics	133,881,000	130,950,000	138,950,000	130,950,000
(Operating expenses)	(112,371,000)	(113,350,000)	(121,350,000)	(113,350,000)
(Capital equipment)	(9,510,000)	(9,900,000)	(9,900,000)	(9,900,000)
(Construction)	(12,000,000)	(7,700,000)	(7,700,000)	(7,700,000)
IV. General Science program direction - OE	1,935,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	547,602,000	600,970,000	601,205,000	607,205,000
(Operating expenses)	(428,892,000)	(483,670,000)	(483,120,000)	(482,120,000)
(Capital equipment)	(52,210,000)	(59,100,000)	(56,885,000)	(56,885,000)
(Construction)	(66,500,000)	(58,200,000)	(61,200,000)	(68,200,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Adjustments:				
FY 1981 Deferrals: Operating expneses - ER (GS).......	-5,000,000	---	---	---
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH..................	542,602,000	600,970,000	601,205,000	607,205,000
(Operating expenses)..................................	(423,892,000)	(483,670,000)	(483,120,000)	(482,120,000)
(Capital equipment)..................................	(52,210,000)	(59,100,000)	(56,885,000)	(56,885,000)
(Construction)..................................	(66,500,000)	(58,200,000)	(61,200,000)	(68,200,000)

The research development of the new projectile continued until 1979 when Secretary of Defense Brown directed a deep cut in the fiscal year 1981 budget request, and then eliminated development funds in fiscal year 1982. Pursuant to the revised budget request, Congress approved further research and development engineering funds for the new 155mm nuclear warhead, the W82, in fiscal year 1982.

The fiscal year 1983 budget request proposes $40,000,000 for production facilities and equipment for the W82, 155mm artillery warhead. The Department is currently in production on an 8 inch artillery warhead and the Lance missile warhead. Military leaders acknowledge that there is little, if any, military value to these weapons unless they can be deployed in Europe. Uncertainty surrounds these deployment decisions. The uncertainty of deployment also applies to the 155mm artillery warhead regardless of its final capabilities.

The Committee is also concerned over the extremely high costs of the W82, 155mm warhead. When the W74 warhead was canceled in 1973, its cost was reported as less than $500,000 each. The new guided 155mm conventional Cooperhead shell has a unit cost of about $24,000. Although the cost of the W82 is classified, the substantial increases in cost over the W74 and in comparison to the conventional round appear to be unwarranted and unjustified.

In view of these considerations, the Committee believes that it is premature to proceed to spend billions of dollars on these nuclear artillery warheads at this time. The administration should explore alternative conventional options which may provide enhanced deterrence at less cost.

With the construction activities, the Committee recommends a slight reduction of $10,000,000 to reflect a lower inflation rate assumption and favorable construction bids.

Program direction.—The recommendation of $53,291,000, the same as the House, includes $11,988,000 for community assistance payments.

The following table shows the Committee recommendations by program for new (budget) obligational authority in comparison to the current year, the budget estimates, and House allowance.

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

The materials production program primarily provides the special nuclear materials used in the development, testing, and production of nuclear weapons. The Committee recommends large increases to allow the Department to continue to operate necessary production reactors, processing facilities, and support facilities. The recommendation will continue the escalated efforts to upgrade the L reactor at the Savannah River plant, to produce additional quantities of weapon-grade material in the three operating Savannah River production reactors, to continue efforts for reactivation of the PUREX fuel processing facility at Hanford, and to convert the N reactor at Hanford to weapon-grade plutonium production.

The Committee recognizes that signficant new initiatives are necessary to meet the projected requirements for special nuclear materials.

The Committee recongizes that long lead times are involved in order to meet future needs. Nevertheless, the Committee is concerned that the Department has proposed several new and expensive initiatives that appear to provide only marginal supply contributions.

Because of the magnitude of the investment and lead times involved, the Department must give increased emphasis to long-term planning in the materials production program.

The availability of special nuclear materials is influenced as much by recovery of materials from weapons being retired as it is influenced by the new production of such materials. As stated earlier, additional attention needs to be focused on the retirement program as well as all other alternatives for meeting special materials requirements.

The Committee recommendation for materials production totals $1,314,060,000, an increase of $14,910,000 over the House allowance and $23,490,000 below the budget request. The budget request represents a 36-percent increase over fiscal year 1982 levels excluding the supplemental request and a 31-percent increase with the supplemental appropriations which became available in late September 1982. The Committee recommends a total of $371,126,000, a 28-percent increase over the fiscal year 1982 level.

Reactor operations.—The Committee recommends $413,900,000 for reactor operations, an increase of $19,540,000 over the House allowance and $22,260,000 below the budget request. The Committee agrees with the House action on restricting funding for the N reactor 5 percent and higher power option. The recommendation also includes a reduction of $8,000,000 in the increase to reflect the more recent projections of inflation estimates.

The Committee provides funding for the Mark XV program, but has reservations about the cost and need of the program. The Department should address this issue in the context of its 1984 budget request.

Processing of nuclear materials.—The Committee recommends $238,950,000, an increase of $1,650,000 over the House allowance and $25,350,000 below the budget request.

For operating expenses, the recommendation provides $200,250,000, an increase of $47,200,000 over fiscal year 1982 levels, a 33-percent increase. This will permit the earlier reactivation of the PUREX facility and the blending operations at Savannah River.

Project 82–D–201, special plutonium recovery facility, the Committee includes $11,000,000 to initiate design and other activities on the new facility to replace the older processing facility. The Committee directs the Department to submit additional justification for the need, scope, and cost of this construction project. No funds other than those for design activities are available without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations.

Enriched material.—The Committee recommends $109,000,000, the same as the House, in operating expenses for production of enriched materials for naval cores. This funding historically has been in DOE accounts. However, in 1983, OMB included it in the Department of Navy's O. & M.N. request. The OMB proposal would alter a long-standing arrangement between DOE (including its predecessor agencies) and the DOD. It does not offer any cost savings—instead it would require establishment of a duplicate inventory account and unneeded paperwork between the Departments.

Special isotope separation.—The recommendation for special isotope separation research provides for $62,200,000, a reduction of $8,000,000 from the House allowance and $32,200,000 over the budget request. The amount provided will accelerate development of this technology which has the potential of saving billions of dollars.

Supporting services.—The Committee recommends $368,310,000 for operating services, a reduction of $9,380,000 below the House allowance and $19,780,000 below the budget request.

For operating expenses, $222,260,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1983 which is slightly less than the budget request increase of $85,886,000 or 56 percent over 1982 levels. This adjustment will allow continuation of higher priority activities and is consistent with the recommendations for reactor operations and processing of nuclear materials.

For plant and capital equipment, the Committee provides $253,750,000, the same as the budget request.

Program direction.—The recommendation of $14,000,000 for program direction provides $2,100,000 for 42 full-time and 4 full-time equivalents to manage the materials production programs. The recommendation also provides $11,900,000 for funding of the Savannah River operations office in the materials production program rather than departmental administration. Since the majority of the activities performed at Savannah River are in support of the materials production program, this transfer will significantly improve matching personnel requirements with programmatic activities and will permit better evaluation of the total costs associated with the production of nuclear materials. This approach is consistent with the manner in which the Albuquerque and Nevada offices are budgeted for in weapons activities.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation provides a total $528,770,000 for defense waste activities, an increase of $8,000,000 over the budget request and $13,000,000 above the House allowance. Although there are substantial increases over fiscal year 1982 levels, most of the increase in this program is concentrated in construction projects.

Interim waste management.—The recommendation includes $277,270,000, an increase of $3,000,000 above the House and $4,000,000 below the budget request.

Long-term waste management.—The Committee provides $104,300,000 for long-term waste management technology, which is $10,000,000 over the House allowance and $12,000,000 above the budget.

Project 82–T–105, defense waste processing facilities, the Committee recommends $40,000,000, an increase of $10,000,000 over the House allowance and budget request.

Decontamination and decommissioning.—The Committee recommends $12,800,000, the same as the House and the budget request.

Within the funds available for defense nuclear waste management, an additional $3,800,000, which was requested in the remedial action program, is provided for the continuation of decommissioning operations and related activities at the Mound facility.

NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommendation provides $420,760,000 for the naval reactors development program, an increase of $12,000,000 over the House allowance and the same as the budget request in both operating expenses and plant and capital equipment.

Project 82-N-111, materials facility, Savannah River, the Committee provides $40,000,000, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

The Committee's attention was invited to the possible impact of this facility on workload and employment levels at the existing facility located at Erwin, Tenn.

The Committee understands that the Department of Energy is negotiating a new 5-year contract covering its anticipated requirements during that period for continued operations at Erwin. The Committee further understands that the Department has made a strong commitment to maintain that facility as a primary souce of supply beyond the expiration of that contract. The Committee intends to monitor carefully the Department's commitment and will not hesitate through actions on future appropriation requests to see that it is maintained.

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

The Committee recommendation for verification and control technology provides $53,400,000, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

NUCLEAR MATERIALS SECURITY

The Committee recommends $47,360,000 for nuclear materials security and safeguards development within this program, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

The Committee recommends $20,500,000 for the security investigations program in fiscal year 1983, a reduction of $8,000,000 below the House allowance and budget request. The Committee is concerned with the cost growth in this program. The requirement to carefully control the access to sensitive facilities and information is recognized and supported. However, this account has nearly doubled since fiscal year 1980 and the Committee feels that the Department should reevaluate this program to seek cost savings.

The Committee has reduced the request by $8,000,000, since that amount is used to grant security clearances to other-than-defense activities according to the justification data and the Committee feels these clearances should be paid for by the agency requesting them.

The following table reflects the Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1983 along with the House allowance and budget request.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES				
I. Weapons activities				
A. Research and development				
Operating expenses	584,900,000	649,600,000	641,600,000	641,600,000
Capital equipment	59,550,000	62,500,000	62,500,000	62,500,000
83-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	13,500,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
83-D-122 Los Alamos Airport improvement LANL, N.M.	---	---	3,100,000	3,100,000
83-D-199 Buffer Land Acquisition, various locations	---	---	3,000,000	---
82-D-144 Simulation technology laboratory, SNLA	1,200,000	---	6,000,000	3,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-D-210 Temp. fac. - intermediate term	---	---	---	---
82-D-150 Weapons materials research and development facility, LLNL	2,500,000	---	10,000,000	---
82-D-152 New detonator facility, LANL	4,000,000	---	9,100,000	7,500,000
82-D-153 Tritium facility, LANL	5,000,000	---	2,600,000	1,600,000
81-D-133 Earthquake damage restoration, LLNL, CA	2,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
81-D-134 Earthquake damage restoration, SNLL, CA	1,000,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
79-7-C Proton storage ring, LANL, NM.........	14,000,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
Prior year projects.........................	22,800,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction......................	66,000,000	18,000,000	51,800,000	33,200,000
Subtotal, Plant & capital...................	125,550,000	80,500,000	114,300,000	95,700,000
Total, Research and development..............	710,450,000	730,100,000	755,900,000	737,300,000
B. Inertial confinement fusion				
Operating expenses..........................	122,362,000	122,000,000	140,000,000	122,000,000
Capital equipment...........................	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Construction:				
81-D-101 Particle beam fusion accelerator-II SNL, NM................................	20,000,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
78-4-A High energy laser facility (NOVA) LLNL, CA	37,500,000	17,000,000	36,000,000	17,000,000
Prior year projects	18,200,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	75,700,000	19,750,000	38,750,000	19,750,000
Subtotal, Plant & capital	86,700,000	30,750,000	49,750,000	30,750,000
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	209,062,000	152,750,000	189,750,000	152,750,000
C. Testing				
Operating expenses	361,400,000	425,400,000	415,000,000	415,000,000
Capital equipment	22,550,000	32,500,000	30,500,000	30,500,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
83-D-101 General plant projects...............	2,300,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
Prior year projects........................	3,600,000	---	---	---
Subtotal Construction........................	5,900,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
Subtotal, Plant & capital....................	28,450,000	36,300,000	34,300,000	34,300,000
Total, Testing................................	389,850,000	461,700,000	449,300,000	449,300,000
D. Production and surveillance				
Operating expenses............................	1,278,183,000	1,573,800,000	1,510,000,000	1,479,100,000
Capital equipment.............................	70,000,000	95,000,000	92,000,000	92,000,000
Construction:				
83-D-123 General plant projects..............	11,300,000	16,300,000	16,300,000	16,300,000
83-D-124 Standard missile-2 (SM-2) warhead production facilities, various locations.....	---	7,000,000	1,000,000	7,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-D-134 Low altitude defense systems warhead production facility	---	16,300,000	---	---
82-D-106 Weapon assembly facilities, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	23,500,000	16,500,000	9,100,000	16,500,000
82-D-107 Utilities & equip restoration, replace & upgrade, Phase III, var. locations.	66,000,000	173,300,000	154,400,000	173,300,000
82-D-108 Nuclear weapons stuckpile improvement, various locations	9,500,000	38,800,000	20,500,000	33,300,000
82-D-109 155mm artillery fired atomic projectile (AFAP) prod facs, various location	15,000,000	40,000,000	26,500,000	---
82-D-110 Exhaust plenum modifications Rocky Flats, Colo	---	---	---	---
82-D-111 Interactive graphics system, various locations	---	12,000,000	12,000,000	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
82-D-146 weapons prod. & prod. support facs. various locations	8,000,000	50,000,000	35,000,000	40,000,000
81-D-115 MX warhead prod. facs. various locations	9,100,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000
78-16-A Cruise missile production facilities various, locations	44,700,000	16,000,000	300,000	16,000,000
78-17-D Steam plant improvements, Y-12 Plant Oak Ridge, TN	9,000,000	6,000,000	2,800,000	6,000,000
Prior year projects	103,200,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Contingencies & uncertainties (FY83 $40.5 M).	-25,000,000	---	20,000,000	---
Inflation estimates	-26,000,000	---	---	-10,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	248,300,000	452,200,000	357,900,000	358,400,000
Subtotal, Plant & capital	318,300,000	547,200,000	449,900,000	450,400,000
Total, Production and surveillance	1,596,483,000	2,121,000,000	1,959,900,000	1,929,500,000
E. Program direction - OE	50,488,000	51,291,000	53,291,000	53,291,000
Total, Weapons activities	2,956,333,000	3,516,841,000	3,408,141,000	3,322,141,000
(Operating expenses)	(2,397,333,000)	(2,822,091,000)	(2,759,891,000)	(2,710,991,000)
(Capital equipment)	(163,100,000)	(201,000,000)	(196,000,000)	(196,000,000)
(Construction)	(395,900,000)	(493,750,000)	(452,250,000)	(415,150,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Materials production				
A. Reactor operations				
Operating expenses	284,830,000	360,460,000	345,460,000	338,200,000
Construction:				
83-D-146 Water pollution control, FMPC Fernald, Ohio	---	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
83-D-180 Facility storage mods	---	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000
82-D-126 Reactor safety and reliability, various locations	4,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
81-D-142 steam transfer header, Savannah River Plant, SC	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-D-143 L-reactor upgrade, Savannah River, SC	62,500,000	52,500,000	25,700,000	52,500,000
Subtotal, Construction	72,000,000	75,700,000	48,900,000	75,700,000
Subtotal, Reactor operations	356,830,000	436,160,000	394,360,000	413,900,000
B. Processing of nuclear materials				
Operating expenses	153,050,000	220,600,000	210,600,000	200,250,000
Construction:				
83-D-142 Fuel dissolver off-gas transfer and treatment system, IFPF, INEL, ID	---	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
82-D-201 Special plutonium recovery facs, F-chem separations area, Savannah River, SC	---	16,000,000	16,000,000	11,000,000
81-D-126 Pollution abatement facilities-chemical processing plants, Richland, WA	2,600,000	2,700,000	1,700,000	2,700,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-D-131 Remote analytical facility upgarde and expansion, IFPF, INEL, ID................	11,000,000	8,500,000	3,500,000	8,500,000
80-AE-2 Replace obsolete processing facs., HB-LINE, Savannah River, SC..................	2,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	3,000,000
77-13-A Fluorinel dissolution process & fuel receiving improve, IFPF, INEL, ID............	40,000,000	10,000,000	---	10,000,000
Subtotal, Construction.......................	55,600,000	43,700,000	26,700,000	38,700,000
Subtotal, Processing of nuclear materials........	208,650,000	264,300,000	237,300,000	238,950,000
C. Enriched Material				
Operating expenses(including Dept. of Defense)	---	109,000,000	109,000,000	109,000,000
D. Special isotope separation research				
Operating expenses...........................	39,200,000	23,000,000	63,000,000	55,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
81-T-502 Special isotope separation lab., LLNL, CA	14,000,000	7,200,000	7,200,000	7,200,000
Subtotal, Special isotope separation research	53,200,000	30,200,000	70,200,000	62,200,000
E. Supporting services				
Operating expenses	156,154,000	242,040,000	227,040,000	222,260,000
Construction:				
83-D-135 General plant projects	20,000,000	26,000,000	24,000,000	26,000,000
83-D-136 Plant engineering and design, various locations	---	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
83-D-138 Purex canyon & dissolver filter systems improvements, Richland, WA	---	4,250,000	4,250,000	4,250,000
83-D-147 Pollution discharge elimination, Savannah River, SC	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC................	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
82-D-124 Restoration of production capabilities, Phase II & III, various locations.	45,000,000	87,700,000	76,800,000	87,700,000
82-D-136 Fuel processing facilities upgrade, IFPF, INEL, Idaho...........................	10,500,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
81-D-128 Restoration of production capabilities, Phase I, various locations........	10,000,000	10,100,000	2,600,000	10,100,000
Contingencies & uncertainties (FY83 $55.1 M).	---	---	25,000,000	---
Prior year projects.........................	15,500,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction..............................	101,000,000	146,050,000	150,650,000	146,050,000
Total, Supporting services.......................	257,154,000	388,090,000	377,690,000	368,310,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
F. Capital equipment	65,300,000	107,700,000	96,600,000	107,700,000
G. Program direction - OE	1,800,000	2,100,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
Subtotal, Materials production	942,934,000	1,337,550,000	1,299,150,000	1,314,060,000
(Operating expenses)	(635,034,000)	(957,200,000)	(969,100,000)	(938,710,000)
(Capital equipment)	(65,300,000)	(107,700,000)	(96,600,000)	(107,700,000)
(Construction)	(242,600,000)	(272,650,000)	(233,450,000)	(267,650,000)
III. Defense nuclear waste management				
A. Interim waste management				
Operating expenses	170,610,000	197,313,000	193,313,000	193,313,000
Capital equipment	16,930,000	25,062,000	24,062,000	25,062,000
Construction:				
83-D-156 General plant projects, various locations	12,532,000	19,145,000	17,145,000	19,145,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-D-157 Additional radioactive waste storage facilities, Richland, WA......................	---	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
82-N-103 Waste handling & isolation facs, Richland, WA................................	10,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
82-N-104 Waste transfer facilities, Richland, WA..	4,000,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000
82-N-107 Rail replacement/Hanford railroad, Richland, WA................................	3,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
81-T-104 Radioactive waste facs. improves., ORNL, Oak Ridge, TN..........................	7,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Prior year projects........................	7,500,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction........................	44,032,000	58,895,000	56,895,000	58,895,000
Subtotal, Plant and capital equipment.........	187,540,000	222,375,000	217,375,000	218,375,000
Total, Interim waste management..................	231,572,000	281,270,000	274,270,000	277,270,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Long-term waste management technology				
Operating expenses	61,600,000	56,861,000	53,861,000	53,861,000
Capital equipment	2,593,000	4,939,000	4,939,000	4,939,000
Construction:				
83-D-159 General plant projects	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
82-BU-1 Byproduct uses demo activities, various locations	---	---	5,000,000	5,000,000
81-T-105 Defense waste processing facilities, Savannah River, SC	20,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	40,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	20,000,000	30,500,000	35,500,000	45,500,000
Subtotal, Plant and capital equipment	64,193,000	61,800,000	58,800,000	58,800,000
Total, Long-term waste management technology	84,193,000	92,300,000	94,300,000	104,300,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Terminal storage				
Operating expenses	3,700,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
Capital equipment	400,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Construction:				
77-13-F Waste isolation pilot plant, Delaware Basin, Southeast, NM	40,000,000	110,800,000	110,800,000	110,800,000
Subtotal, Terminal storage	44,100,000	125,400,000	125,400,000	125,400,000
D. Decontamination and decommissioning				
Operating expenses	5,200,000	12,655,000	12,655,000	12,655,000
Capital equipment	70,000	145,000	145,000	145,000
Subtotal, Decontamination and decommissioning	5,270,000	12,800,000	12,800,000	12,800,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Transportation research and development				
Operating expenses............................	6,067,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	6,100,000
Capital equipment.............................	840,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------
Subtotal, Transportation research & development..	6,907,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
F. Program direction - OE........................	1,851,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------
Subtotal, Defense nuclear waste management.......	373,893,000	520,770,000	515,770,000	528,770,000
(Operating expenses).............................	(249,028,000)	(288,929,000)	(281,929,000)	(281,929,000)
(Capital equipment).............................	(20,833,000)	(31,646,000)	(30,646,000)	(31,646,000)
(Construction).............................	(104,032,000)	(200,195,000)	(203,195,000)	(215,195,000)

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

Appropriations, 1982	$336,107,000
Budget estimate, 1983	245,268,000
House allowance	383,420,000
Committee recommendation	379,388,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+134,120,000
House allowance	−4,032,000

REVENUES APPLIED

Revenues applied, 1982	−$142,700,000
Budget estimate, 1983	−82,855,000
House allowance	−214,155,000
Committee recommendation	−114,155,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−31,300,000
House allowance	+100,000,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1982	$193,987,000
Budget estimate, 1983	162,413,000
House allowance	169,265,000
Committee recommendation	265,233,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+102,820,000
House allowance	+95,968,000

The Committee recommends a net appropriation of $265,233,000 for departmental administration which is $102,820,000 above the budget request and $95,968,000 over the House allowance.

The appropriation recommended for Departmental Administration supports the Department's general management, administrative and program support functions not directly associated with program execution. The account provides for: (1) development and analysis of alternative energy policy proposals, legislation, and evaluation of DOE programs; (2) the salaries, travel and other costs associated with the management and support of DOE; (3) the institutional relations program that provides information services and outreach activities focusing on the industrial, academic, and public communities, evaluation of energy-related inventions and support for energy training and education; (4) the performance of security investigations for persons with access to restricted atomic energy data; (5) development of international energy policy and international cooperation in energy matters; and (6) general purpose stores inventories, revenues from the sale of DOE products and services and their related direct costs.

There is no administration request for fiscal year 1983 for departmental administration activities because of the proposed dismantlement of the Department of Energy. Since its unlikely that the Congress will enact legislation to do this, the Committee recommendation would maintain an appropriation account structure that is essentially identical to that used in prior years. The amount of funding recommended by the Committee within this structure would restore funds and provide for personnel levels necessary to properly manage and administer the Department of Energy as an independent cabinet-level agency at a reduced level of activity consistent with lower program responsibilities. The funding level recommended also reflects changes in the amount of revenues to be used to offset costs within the account, as are described in this section of the report.

Office of Minority Economic Impact.—The Office of Minority Economic Impact (OMEI) was established by Public Law 95–916, the National Energy Conservation Policy Act, to advise the Secretary of Energy on the impact of energy policies on minorities. The fiscal year 1983 budget eliminated all funding for OMEI. In the view of the Committee, this is not consistent with the intent of the law and would eliminate many of the very desirable activities that OMEI is currently engaged in. For this reason, the Committee recommendation provides a total of $1,824,000 for the continuation of the OMEI and its programs. Of this amount, $360,000 is included under general management—salaries and the balance is under general management—expenses and program support activities for the conduct of studies and analyses.

Indian affairs program.—The Committee recommendation provides that up to $1,000,000 from policy and analysis is to be used for the Council of Energy Resource Tribes (CERT).

Estimated revenues.—The Committee recommendation of $114,155,-000 in miscellaneous revenues in fiscal year 1983 assumes the use of certain miscellaneous revenues, as authorized by Public Law 95–238, for services, sales of steam and special materials, and other items. In the fiscal year 1983 request, OMB proposed to apply certain of these revenues to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. The Committee action reclaims revenues to offset program costs as in prior years.

Cost of work for others.—The Department of Energy conducts a significant amount of work for others. This work is performed by DOE because of its unique capabilities in selected areas. The conduct of this activity not only benefits the customer but also aids the Department by more fully utilizing existing facilities, complimenting departmental activities, fostering cooperativeness between the Department and the private sector and other countries, and by stretching funds available to DOE. It is difficult to accurately project the cost of work for a given year. The proposed language would permit the Department to conduct work for others to the extent that the increased costs are offset by additional revenues. This will allow the needed flexibility for DOE to conduct cost of work for others while requiring no additional Federal funds.

The following tables show the Committee recommendations by program for new (budget) obligational authority in comparison to the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Naval reactors development				
A. Plant development				
Operating expenses	54,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000
B. Reactor development				
Operating expenses	125,700,000	160,000,000	148,000,000	160,000,000
Construction:				
83-N-101 General plant projects	4,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
83-N-102 Additions to radioactive materials laboratory, Schenectady, NY	---	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
82-N-111 Materials facility, Savannah River, SC	15,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-T-112 Mods. and additions to prototype facs., various locations	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000
Subtotal, Construction	54,000,000	78,000,000	78,000,000	78,000,000
Subtotal, Reactor development	179,700,000	238,000,000	226,000,000	238,000,000
C. Reactor operation and evaluation				
Operating expenses	88,000,000	104,100,000	104,100,000	104,100,000
D. Capital equipment	28,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
E. Program direction - OE	9,420,000	9,660,000	9,660,000	9,660,000
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	359,120,000	420,760,000	408,760,000	420,760,000
(Operating expenses)	277,120,000	331,760,000	319,760,000	331,760,000
(Capital equipment)	28,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
(Construction)	54,000,000	78,000,000	78,000,000	78,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
V. Verification and control technology				
Operating expenses	49,100,000	50,600,000	50,600,000	50,600,000
Capital equipment	1,100,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Program direction - OE	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	52,000,000	53,900,000	53,900,000	53,900,000
(Operating expenses)	(50,900,000)	(52,400,000)	(52,400,000)	(52,400,000)
(Capital equipment)	(1,100,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)
VI. Nuclear materials security & safeguards				
Operating expenses	38,381,000	37,310,000	37,310,000	37,310,000
Capital equipment	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
Construction:				
83-D-175 General plant projects	---	500,000	500,000	500,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Program direction - OE	5,138,000	5,850,000	5,850,000	5,850,000
Subtotal, Nuclear matls. sec. & safe. dev	47,219,000	47,360,000	47,360,000	47,360,000
(Operating expenses)	43,519,000	43,160,000	43,160,000	43,160,000
(Capital equipment)	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
(Construction)	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
VII. Security investigations - OE	23,600,000	28,500,000	28,500,000	20,500,000
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	4,755,099,000	5,925,681,000	5,761,581,000	5,707,491,000
(Operating expenses)	(3,676,534,000)	(4,524,040,000)	(4,454,740,000)	(4,379,450,000)
(Capital equipment)	(282,033,000)	(356,546,000)	(339,446,000)	(351,546,000)
(Construction)	(796,532,000)	(1,045,095,000)	(967,395,000)	(976,495,000)

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Section 302(a) of Public Law 95–91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Alaska Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation including the transmission and disposition of electric power and energy from Falcon and Amistad Dams, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

Bonneville Power operations are self-financing under authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974. The act authorizes Bonneville Power to use its revenues to finance operating costs, capital construction and to sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining capital program requirements.

All other power marketing administrations are funded annually in appropriations and related receipts are deposited in the Treasury. In fiscal year 1983, these receipts are estimated by the DOE to total $2,933,000,000, compared to $2,303,000,000 in fiscal year 1982.

The following table summarizes the appropriations recommended for the power marketing administrations.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION				
I. Office of the Secretary - Salaries and expenses				
A. Office of the Secretary........................	1,414,000	505,000	864,000	864,000
C. Other expenses.................................	679,000	144,000	361,000	361,000
Subtotal, Office of the Secretary - OE...........	2,093,000	649,000	1,225,000	1,225,000
II. General management - salaries				
A. Board of Contract Appeals......................	232,000	160,000	225,000	225,000
B. General Counsel...............................	11,992,000	4,824,000	8,726,000	10,023,000
C. Inspector General.............................	6,053,000	6,273,000	5,824,000	5,824,000
D. A/S Management & Administration................	38,424,000	18,637,000	31,031,000	34,048,000
E. A/S Cons., Intergov. & Public Affairs..........	4,827,000	1,022,000	3,376,000	4,850,000
F. Power Marketing Coordination...................	543,000	310,000	377,000	547,000
G. Regional / Operations Offices..................	59,481,000	42,595,000	61,198,000	61,198,000
H. Policy, Planning & Analysis....................	4,623,000	335,000	3,224,000	3,224,000
I. A/S International Affairs......................	3,229,000	---	1,911,000	1,911,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
J. Office of Minority Economic Impact	---	---	360,000	360,000
K. Regional Counsel	---	---	961,000	236,000
Subtotal, Salaries	129,404,000	74,156,000	117,213,000	122,446,000
III. General management - other expenses				
A. Other Salary expenses	10,809,000	4,745,000	8,100,000	8,742,000
B. Benefits	14,826,000	10,906,000	12,531,000	13,524,000
C. Travel	5,059,000	2,638,000	5,300,000	5,000,000
D. Services	112,803,000	61,836,000	120,000,000	117,400,000
E. Workmens Compensation	918,000	1,320,000	1,320,000	1,320,000
F. Severence payments	---	14,920,000	---	---
G. Capital equipment	3,613,000	1,715,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
Subtotal, Other expenses	148,028,000	98,080,000	149,551,000	148,286,000
(Operating expenses)	(144,415,000)	(96,365,000)	(147,251,000)	(145,986,000)
(Capital equipment)	(3,613,000)	(1,715,000)	(2,300,000)	(2,300,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Program Support				
A. Policy analysis and system studies - OE.......	8,923,000	250,000	5,613,000	5,613,000
B. Intergovernmental and Institutional Relations				
2. Consumer Affairs - OE......................	100,000	---	100,000	100,000
3. Public Affairs				
Operating expenses..........................	200,000	150,000	103,000	103,000
4. Competition - OE..........................	100,000	---	100,000	100,000
Subtotal, Intergov, & Institutional Relations....	400,000	150,000	303,000	303,000
C. International Policy Studies - OE............	225,000	---	250,000	250,000
E. Cost of work for others.......................	47,614,000	71,983,000	109,265,000	109,265,000
Subtotal, Program Support........................	57,162,000	72,383,000	115,431,000	115,431,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Unobligated balance carried forward..............	---	---	---	-8,000,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION...................	336,687,000	245,268,000	383,420,000	379,388,000
IV. Miscellaneous revenues..........................	-142,700,000	-82,855,000	-214,155,000	-114,155,000
Miscellaneous receipts (memo non-add)............	---	(-92,386,000)	---	---
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION - NET....................	193,987,000	162,413,000	169,265,000	265,233,000
(Operating expenses)................................	(333,074,000)	(243,553,000)	(381,120,000)	(377,088,000)
(Capital equipment)................................	(3,613,000)	(1,715,000)	(2,300,000)	(2,300,000)
(Miscellaneous revenues)............................	(-142,700,000)	(-82,855,000)	(-214,155,000)	(-114,155,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Alaska Power Administration				
A. Operating expenses	1,987,000	2,187,000	2,187,000	2,187,000
B. General investigation	893,000	---	300,000	300,000
D. Program direction	658,000	622,000	622,000	622,000
TOTAL ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION	3,538,000	2,809,000	3,109,000	3,109,000
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND				
I. Borrowing Authority - PL 96-501	---	276,000,000	276,000,000	276,000,000
II. Borrowing Authority - PL 93-454 (Permanent indefinite borrowing authority)	(279,720,000)	(179,000,000)	(179,000,000)	(179,000,000)
TOTAL BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION	---	276,000,000	276,000,000	276,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Southeastern power administration				
A. Operating and maintenance........................	1,315,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling......................	9,032,000	10,348,000	10,348,000	10,348,000
C. Offsetting receipt...............................	-3,110,000	---	---	---
D. Unobligated balances carried forward.............	---	---	-3,400,000	---
TOTAL SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION..............	7,237,000	11,848,000	8,448,000	11,848,000
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Southwestern Power Administration				
A. Operation and maintenance	8,521,000	9,070,000	9,070,000	9,070,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling......................	9,210,000	20,690,000	20,690,000	20,690,000

Alaska Power Administration

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1982	$3,538,000
Budget estimate, 1983	2,809,000
House allowance	3,109,000
Committee recommendation	3,109,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+300,000
House allowance	…………

An appropriation of $3,109,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the House allowance and $300,000 over the budget request.

The Alaska Power Administration operates, maintains, and markets power for the two Federal hydroelectric projects in Alaska, and conducts investigations of future water and power resource developments and power system studies. Program objectives include: maximizing benefits and protecting investments for the operating projects, and contributing, through the investigative programs, to use and development of renewable energy sources, such as hydroelectric, for Alaska's power needs. The State's power systems are presently dependent on oil and natural gas for over 75 percent of energy requirements; demands are increasing rapidly; and opportunities exist to shift to coal and hydroelectric resources using environmentally sound projects. Revenues from power marketing are delivered to the Treasury and are expected to total $4,000,000 in fiscal year 1982. This reflects a slight decrease from the fiscal 1981 level.

The Committee has provided $300,000 over the request in order to provide for a more gradual phase out of the general investigation program. This will allow the Alaska Power Administration to complete investigations of potential interconnections between the Snettisham project and other areas of Southeast Alaska, continue work on the Bradley Lake operation and marketing plan, and complete the power statistics program which would have to be terminated prematurely under the budget proposal.

Bonneville Power Administration Fund

Appropriations, 1982	…………
Budget estimate, 1983	$276,000,000
House allowance	276,000,000
Committee recommendation	276,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	…………
House allowance	…………

LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS

Appropriations, 1982	($40,000,000)
Budget estimate, 1983	(62,000,000)
House allowance	(62,000,000)
Committee recommendation	(62,000,000)
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is the Federal electric power marketing agency for the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS), which consists of the hydroelectric generating facilities in the Pacific Northwest of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior (30 projects at present), plus BPA's transmission system of more than 12,794 circuit-miles of high-voltage transmission lines and 350 substations. BPA markets about one-half of the electric power produced in the Northwest and provides about four-fifths of the region's bulk electric power transmission capacity. Also, BPA markets and exchanges electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

BPA operates on a self-financing basis, thus requiring no appropriations. However, BPA's fiscal year 1983 budget reflects the need for borrowing authority of $455,000,000 to carry out the proposed program and new responsibilities pursuant to Public Law 96–501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act.

The appropriation bill also includes language, recommended by the Committee, providing BPA with the full amount of multiyear borrowing authority authorized in Public Law 96–501 so that BPA and its electric ratepayers can be assured sufficient borrowing authority is available for BPA to acquire cost effective, self-financed conservation resources to meet or reduce the loads of its electric customers.

The Committee intends that the Bonneville Power Administrator construe the authority pursuant to Public Law 96–501 broadly, so as to encourage the development and acquisition of cost-effective conservation resources, conservation measures, and renewable resources in the Pacific Northwest to meet or reduce the Administrator's obligations.

The funds made available to the Administrator for loans and grants are obligations of the region's ratepayers and do not derive from appropriations financed from tax revenues. Therefore, the region's ratepayers, rather than the Nation's taxpayers, are obligated to repay any funds borrowed from the U.S. Treasury for loans and grants for conservation and renewable resources.

The Committee expects BPA to implement these new programs and responsibilities in a careful and prudent manner so as to avoid unnecessary future costs to its electric ratepayers.

Creston line.—BPA proposed in its budget to commence work in fiscal year 1983 on a new 500-kV double-circuit transmission line from the

Bell Substantion to Grand Coulee (item 127), the Creston line. Subsequently, however BPA withdrew that request. Accordingly, the Committee has not included appropriation language for this project. However, the Committee notes that such a line will be needed to transmit power from the Creston coal-fired plant, if built, and that several non-Federal public and private utilities are interested in constructing such a line themselves or jointly with BPA. Therefore, the Committee directs BPA to cooperate with those utilities and to aggressively explore the option of non-Federal participation in construction and ownership of the line on Federal right-of-way, if and when the line is built.

500 kV line.—The Committee believes that BPA should continue to take all appropriate steps to complete the environmental analysis of the alternatives for the planning, design, and construction of the 500-kV transmission line (Allston-Portland area reinforcement project) through southwestern Washington and northwestern Oregon. Before there is a decision regarding construction of these facilities, the Administrator is expected to assure the Committee that there has been full compliance with the requirements of both the National Environmental Policy Act and Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act.

FERC review.—The Committee believes that the House report language regarding FERC review of power marketing agency rates should not apply to BPA. FERC has recently established its review authority over BPA rates in an order determining jurisdiction under the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act. The Committee agrees with FERC's view of its role. Thus, FERC should be able to discharge its review obligations regarding BPA rates within 9 to 12 months from the time of filing.

Mitchell Act program.—The Committee recommends the transfer of lead Federal management responsibility for the Mitchell Act program from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA).

This action should assure the long-term financing for critical anadromous fish mitigation work, eliminate unnecessary Federal overhead, and improve the planning and coordination process.

The Mitchell Act was the initial attempt by the Federal Government to mitigate impacts of Federal dams. Despite the large capital investment provided by this program, there is much that remains to be done.

Under the current arrangements the NMFS serves as the lead Federal agency in coordinating the efforts of the cooperating agencies. The major thrust of the program is to provide funds to the cooperating agencies for hatchery operations.

The administration proposes to eliminate Federal financing by fiscal year 1985 on the basis that the Federal Government has fulfilled its mitigation responsibility and that funding for these activities are more appropriately the responsibility of the State, local, or private entities. While the Committee supports the principle that the primary beneficiaries should bear the cost, it disagrees that funds previously provided and the benefits derived from the Federal dams on the Columbia River and its tributaries absolve the Federal Government from any further financial responsibility under the Mitchell Act.

In view of the Northwest Power Planning Council's statutory oversight responsibility and the BPA's role in regional planning, it is the Committee's view that the program requirements can best be met by transferring lead Federal management responsibility for coordinating the Mitchell Act program to BPA.

BPA should include in its budget material, a distribution of program costs funded through power revenues as well as appropriations to other Federal agencies. It is the Committee's intent that water development and power marketing agencies will continue to use to the fullest extent practical the facilities and expertise of the State fish and game agencies, the USFWS and NMFS in carrying out this program rather than duplicating those capabilities.

BPA, in consultation with the Council, shall report 6 months after the enactment of this act on the progress and plans for implementing this provision along with recommendations for legislative changes that may be necessary.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1982	$7,237,000
Budget estimate, 1983	11,848,000
House allowance	8,448,000
Committee recommendation	11,848,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	....
House allowance	+3,400,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $11,848,000, which is the same as the budget request.

The appropriation provides for (1) scheduling the generation of power and supervision of power deliveries, (2) purchase of firming energy to meet customer load requirements and payment of wheeling charges for delivery of power over non-Federal transmission lines (3) administration of contracts for the sale of power costs, and (4) general administration and support of Southeastern's power marketing program.

The Southeastern Power Administration (SEPA) markets hydroelectric power produced at Federal projects located in 10 Southeastern States in accordance with policy directives contained in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. The States include Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi.

Southeastern now markets power from 21 Federal dams in the Southeast with a combined capacity of 2,712 megawatts. The power is currently sold to 199 wholesale customers.

As of the end of fiscal year 1981, the cumulative Federal investment in SEPA projects totaled $1,002,000,000. Of this, $245,000,000 had been repaid to the Treasury with interest totaling $356,000,000, leaving an unrepaid investment of $757,000,000.

SEPA gross revenues for fiscal year 1983 are estimated to total $64,300,000, compared to $61,200,000 in 1982. Program requirements increase principally for purchased power to meet contract obligations based on average water conditions.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1982	$21,269,000
Budget estimate, 1983	34,290,000
House allowance	23,690,000
Committee recommendation	34,290,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	…………
House allowance	+10,600,000

The Committee recommends concurrence with the budget request of $34,290,000.

The Southwestern Power Administration (SWPA) is the marketing agent for the disposal of power and energy generated at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana. It is headquartered in Tulsa, Okla., with an operation control center located in Springfield, Mo., and maintenance crews and support warehouses located in Muskogee and Ada, Okla.; Jonesboro, Ark.; and Springfield, Mo.

The SWPA provides transmission lines, substations, switching stations, and communication facilities for integration and optimal distribution of electricity from hydroelectric projects for transmission and sale of power to geographically dispersed customers.

The SWPA schedules and controls the generation of power from 22 hydroelectric projects to 65 contracts from 59 system interconnection points with publicly and privately owned utilities. In addition, the SWPA operates and maintains 1,665 miles of transmission lines consisting of 161kV, 138kV and 69kV wood pole and steel construction. It performs maintenance on 20 radio and microwave stations, 12 switching and 20 substations, with a total substation capacity of 1,083,434 KVA.

The cumulative Federal investment in power generation and transmission facilities assigned to SWPA totals $679,000,000. Repayments through fiscal year 1981 totaled $31,000,000 along with interest of $305,000,000. Southwestern's general rate increase was approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in January 1982. This action, along with contract renegotiations in 1981, should allow SWPA to become more current in its repayment program.

Southwestern's gross revenues for fiscal year 1983 are estimated to total $66,700,000, compared to $62,500,000 in fiscal year 1982.

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1982	$210,774,000
Budget estimate, 1983	207,200,000
House allowance	174,200,000
Committee recommendation	207,200,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	....
House allowance	+33,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $207,200,000, the same as the budget request.

The Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance program of the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), excluding the Colorado River storage project and Fort Peck project, involves marketing federally generated hydroelectric power within a 15-State area in the West.

Western is responsible for the operation and maintenance of about 16,000 miles of transmission lines and over 200 substations. Electric power marketed by Western is generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission in Texas, all of which operate some 48 hydropower generating plants in Western's service area with a current installed generating capacity of 8,065,144 kilowatts.

Western, through its power marketing program, must secure revenues sufficient to meet the annual costs of operation and maintenance of the generating and transmission facilities, purchased power, wheeling and other expenses, in order to repay all of the power investment with interest, and to repay that portion of the Government's irrigation and other nonpower investments which are beyond the water users' repayment capability. Under the Colorado River Basins power marketing fund, which encompasses the Colorado River Basin, Fort Peck, and Colorado River storage projects, all operation and maintenance and power marketing expenses are financed from revenues.

The cumulative Federal investment in power generation and transmission facilities assigned to WAPA through fiscal year 1981 is $3,729,000,000. Repayments totaled $1,262,000,000 along with interest of $923,000,000, leaving an unrepaid investment of $2,467,000,000. With recent rate increases, WAPA's repayment status is generally satisfactory except for one or two projects where additional rate action may be needed.

WAPA gross revenues for fiscal year 1983 are estimated to total $399,700,000, compared to $370,300,000 in fiscal year 1982.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1982	$76,177,000
Budget estimate, 1983	92,500,000
House allowance	89,100,000
Committee recommendation	89,100,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−3,400,000
House allowance	

REVENUES APPLIED

Revenues applied, 1982	
Budget estimate, 1983	$60,000,000
House allowance	−60,000,000
Committee recommendation	−60,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1982	$76,177,000
Budget estimate, 1983	32,500,000
House allowance	29,100,000
Committee recommendation	29,100,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−3,400,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends a net appropriation of $29,100,000, which is $3,400,000 below the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

Section 204 and title IV of Public Law 95–91, the Department of Energy Organization Act, established within the Department of Energy the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out functions transferred from the Federal Power Commission for hydroelectric, electric utility, and natural gas regulation and from the Interstate Commerce Commission for oil pipeline regulation.

The act sets out the clear intent of Congress that the Commission be independent from supervision or direction from any other officer of the Department, but provides that the Secretary shall provide to the Commission such support and facilities as the Commission determines it needs to carry out its functions. This support includes services for personnel, accounting, facilities support, computer operations, procurement, and other similar services funded elsewhere in the Departmental request.

As in past years, the Committee continues to encourage the Commission to give full and fair hearings to all points of view, and to keep the public informed of its activities. The Committee believes, however, that the Commission itself is charged by law with representing the public interest and feels it would be counterproductive to pay with Federal funds the expenses of special interest groups reflecting a particular point of view. Therefore, the appropriation included in the bill does not provide for funding intervenor actions.

Trans Alaskan Pipeline System case (TAPS).—Last year the House Committee directed FERC to submit a report dealing with the public interest and costs associated with the TAPS case. This case has been before the Commission since 1977 and over $11,000,000 has been expended on it. Many other cases are backlogged pending its resolution. In fiscal year 1983, FERC requests $1,400,000 to continue handling the TAPS and Williams pipeline case during the first half of the fiscal year 1983.

The Committee feels that 5 years should be sufficient time to resolve even the most complex cases. For this reason, the Committee recommendation includes a reduction of $700,000 in the Commission's overall budget request to encourage progress on these two cases. The Committee directs that the Commission resolve the TAPS and Williams cases during the first half of fiscal year 1983.

FERC user fees.—The administration's budget proposed that FERC be required to collect $60,000,000 from revised fee schedules and retain those revenues to offset their program operating expenses. The administration's intention is to reduce actual Federal regulatory expenses and to more closely relate costs with revenues. While the intention of the proposal is consistent with other revenue-generating activities of the Federal Government, including several in this appropriation bill, the manner in which this would be applied to FERC could have unanticipated and undesirable impacts on FERC's responsibilities. Because of this, the Committee recommendation revises the proposed appropriation language to provide that estimated revenues could be retained and used to offset FERC expenses, but the full recommended total budget authority is available to the Agency at the beginning of the fiscal year and would be reduced only as revenues become available during the fiscal year. The required language, furthermore, provides only for estimated revenues so that if FERC is unable to actually collect the $60,000,000 in fees, then its program and activities will not be reduced as a result of this. Conversely, if more than $60,000,000 is collected, this will further reduce the amount of appropriated funds collected.

This revised language is intended to correct two potential problems with the administration's request: First, that FERC would have to stop operations early in the fiscal year because revenues would not become available until the later part of the fiscal year, and second, that congressional oversight of FERC programs would be decreased. Under the Committee recommendation, there would be no possibility of a cut-off of operations because the full budget authority allowed is available throughout the year. The Committee considers that oversight responsibility will be enhanced rather than decreased by this language because it more accurately delineates the Commission's actual operations and the results of them.

GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND

GEOTHERMAL LOAN GUARANTEE AND INTEREST ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1982	$2,200,000
Budget estimate, 1983	75,000
House allowance	2,200,000
Committee recommendation	2,200,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+2,125,000
House allowance	....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,200,000. This is $2,125,000 above the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

The geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program is authorized under the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-410), as amended by the Department of Energy Act of 1978—Civilian Applications (Public Law 95-238).

The purpose of the program is to accelerate the commercial development and utilization of geothermal energy. Loan guarantees approved under this program are expected to achieve (1) development of normal borrower-lender relationships which, through experience, will encourage the flow of credit without further dependence on Federal financial assistance and (2) enhanced competition to encourage new contracts into the geothermal market.

There continues to be a requirement to pay interest differential payments. Along with the $2,200,000 available from fiscal year 1982 appropriations, the Committee is recommending an additional $2,000,000 in fiscal year 1983 to finance the estimated $3,800,000 interest differential payments in fiscal year 1983 and an additional $125,000 to maintain staff levels to review applications and manage the program.

The Committee reiterates continued strong support for rapid implementation of the geothermal loan guarantee program and notes that the Department has evaluated and made commitments to provide loan guarantees to several geothermal direct heat application projects. The DOE has under consideration applications for projects which would convert the Nation's vast resources of hot water-dominated geothermal energy into electricity. The Committee directs the DOE to continue the evaluation of remaining applications still pending and, pursuant to prior commitments made by the administration, to award loan guarantees to worthy projects. In view of the substantial period of time during which some applications have been awaiting departmental review—amounting to nearly 2 years in one instance—the Committee expects the DOE to complete action on applications within the immediate future and directs the Department to report, at the time of submittal of the fiscal year 1984 budget request, on the disposition of pending applications.

The following table summarizes the Committee recommendations.

GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	Current year enacted	Budget request	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Guarantee reserve fund	2,000		2,000	2,000
Loan evaluation fund	101		125	125
Program direction	200	75	75	75
Fiscal year 1981 deferral	-101			
Total, geothermal resources development fund	2,200	75	2,200	2,200

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Construction	3,538,000	4,530,000	4,530,000	4,530,000
D. Unobligated balances carried forward	---	---	-10,600,000	---
TOTAL SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	21,269,000	34,290,000	23,690,000	34,290,000
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION - CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Western Area Power Administration				
A. Construction and rehabilitation	101,400,000	103,000,000	103,000,000	103,000,000
B. System operation and maintenance	56,174,000	58,200,000	58,200,000	58,200,000
C. Purchase power and wheeling	64,435,000	58,277,000	58,277,000	58,277,000
D. Offsetting receipts	-11,235,000	-12,277,000	-12,277,000	-12,277,000
E. Unobligated balances carried forward	---	---	-33,000,000	---
II. Power marketing - Colorado River Basin				
A. Operation and maintenance	93,400,000	94,400,000	94,400,000	94,400,000
B. Offsetting receipts	-93,400,000	-94,400,000	-94,400,000	-94,400,000
TOTAL WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION	210,774,000	207,200,000	174,200,000	207,200,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION - EMERGENCY FUND				
I. Emergency fund....................................	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
TOTAL WESTERN AREA POWER ADMIN EMERGENCY FUND.........	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
TOTAL POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS.................	243,318,000	532,647,000	485,947,000	532,947,000

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1982	$137,225,000
Budget estimate, 1983	129,250,000
House allowance	158,779,000
Committee recommendation	136,543,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+7,293,000
House allowance	−22,236,000

An appropriation of $136,543,000 is recommended by the Committee, which is $22,236,000 below the House allowance and $7,293,000 above the budget request.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and planning activities are shown in the following table, with Committee comments following immediately after the tabulation.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	ALABAMA								
(N)	ALABAMA - COOSA RIVERS BELOW CLAIBORNE L & D..........	1,850,000	340,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE..	274,000	---	---	---	80,000	---	---	---
(N)	CHOCTAWHATCHEE RIVER BASIN, AL & FL...................	610,000	487,000	123,000	---	123,000	---	123,000	---
(N)	MISS RIVER NAV SYSTEM ADEQUATE MOORING FACIL FOR WATERCRAFT..	1,250,000	525,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR...	3,285,000	700,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	MONTGOMEPY TO GADSDEN, COOSA RIVER....................	1,095,000,000	20,035,000	---	---	---	7,000,000	---	3,000,000
(N)	WARRIOR - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY..........................	2,573,000	2,353,000	320,000	---	750,000	---	320,000	---
	ALASKA								
(FC)	BETHEL BANK STABILIZATION.............................	550,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(N)	KAKE HARBOR....................................	12,600,000	641,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(FDP)	RIVERS AND HARBORS IN ALASKA..........................	7,859,000	1,456,000	550,000	---	550,000	---	650,000	---
(FDP)	SMALL HYDROPOWER......................................	3,550,000	2,195,000	775,000	---	775,000	---	775,000	---
(N)	SOUTHCENTRAL DEEP-DRAFT NAVIGATION....................	1,401,000	896,000	185,000	---	185,000	---	185,000	---
	ARIZONA								
(FDP)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AZ & NM...................	3,650,000	2,200,000	560,000	---	760,000	---	560,000	---
(FC)	HOLBROOK, LITTLE COLORADO RIVER.......................	680,000	125,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	ARKANSAS								
(SPEC)	ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN, AR & OK.........................	2,000,000	---	---	---	310,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER VICINITY OF FT SMITH - VAN BUREN.......	1,270,000	910,000	310,000	---	310,000	---	310,000	---
(N)	ARKANSAS RIV & TRIBS HYDROPOWER & OTHER PURPOSES,AR&OK	2,590,000	1,831,000	437,000	---	437,000	---	437,000	---
(FDP)	CLARKSVILLE...	900,000	75,000	208,000	---	208,000	---	208,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FC)	MCKINNEY BAYOU, AR & TX	6,900,000	810,000	---	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000
(FDP)	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, AR & LA	8,000,000	4,545,000	1,586,000	---	1,586,000	---	1,586,000	---
(FC)	PINE MOUNTAIN LAKE	63,600,000	1,432,000	---	218,000	---	218,000	---	218,000
(COMP)	RED RIVER BASIN, AR, TX, LA & OK	500,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(COMP)	RED RIV BELOW DENISON DAM (AUTH RPTS), AR, LA, OK & TX	1,710,000	782,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	CALIFORNIA								
(FDP)	ALAMEDA CREEK, UPPER BASIN	1,290,000	1,020,000	170,000	---	170,000	---	170,000	---
(FDP)	ANTELOPE VALLEY	1,590,000	544,000	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FC)	CACHE CREEK	1,500,000	---	---	---	70,000	---	70,000	---
(FDP)	CALLEGUAS CREEK	1,725,000	915,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(SPEC)	COAST OF CALIFORNIA, STORM AND TIDAL WAVES	7,000,000	495,000	500,000	---	1,500,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	COTTONWOOD CREEK	458,000,000	8,675,000	---	3,200,000	---	3,200,000	---	3,200,000
(FC)	FAIRFIELD COUNTY STREAMS	18,300,000	687,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---
(N)	FISHERMAN'S WHARF AREA, SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR	600,000	75,000	100,000	---	550,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	GUADALUPE RIVER	1,770,000	1,521,000	---	---	270,000	---	270,000	---
(FDP)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA REVIEW	3,565,000	1,943,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS (INCLUDING SAN PEDRO BAY MODEL)	6,434,000	6,171,000	---	---	441,000	---	160,000	---
(FDP)	MORRISON CREEK STREAM GROUP (PHASE I)	3,000,000	925,000	525,000	---	700,000	---	525,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA STREAMS	8,430,000	6,044,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR (BREAKWATER)	5,790,000	554,000	---	35,000	---	35,000	---	35,000
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR (CHANNEL EXTENSION)	1,700,000	315,000	---	64,000	---	64,000	---	64,000
(N)	OAKLAND INNER HARBOR	495,000	407,000	88,000	---	88,000	---	88,000	---
(N)	OAKLAND OUTER HARBOR (DEEPENING)	220,000	125,000	95,000	---	95,000	---	95,000	---
(FC)	PAJARO RIVER	1,480,000	260,000	---	90,000	---	190,000	---	190,000
(FC)	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEKS	4,300,000	300,000	410,000	---	410,000	---	410,000	---
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR	370,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEP WATER SHIP CHANNEL	3,500,000	250,000	600,000	---	1,100,000	---	600,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FDP)	SACRAMENTO RIVER & TRIBS BANK PROT & EROS CONTROL	2,450,000	2,064,000	297,000	---	297,000	---	297,000	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA (IN-DEPTH)	3,080,000	2,563,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
(FDP)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY SHORELINE	3,414,000	835,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN	7,500,000	4,196,000	994,000	---	994,000	---	994,000	---
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER	26,200,000	1,654,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	SAN PEDRO BAY PORTS	1,220,000	1,081,000	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA ANA RIVER & ORANGE COUNTY	8,170,000	5,997,000	655,000	---	655,000	---	655,000	---
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER (PHASE I)	18,600,000	565,000	3,400,000	---	3,400,000	---	3,400,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY STREAMS	1,330,000	559,000	250,000	---	350,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	SWEETWATER RIVER	21,900,000	1,430,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
	COLORADO								
(FDP)	ARK R & TRIBS ABOVE JOHN MARTIN DAM (PHASE I)	4,300,000	2,371,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ABOVE JOHN MARTIN DAM (FOUNTAIN CREEK)	1,435,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(FC)	WESTERLY CREEK	449,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
	CONNECTICUT								
(N)	BRIDGEPORT HARBOR	642,000	565,000	40,000	---	40,000	---	40,000	---
(COMP)	CONNECTICUT RIVER BASIN, AUTH REPORTS, CT, MA, & NH	4,955,000	2,399,000	273,000	---	273,000	---	273,000	---
(SPEC)	LONG ISLAND SOUND - DREDGED MATERIAL CONTAINMENT STUDY	1,806,000	1,204,000	290,000	---	290,000	---	290,000	---
	DELAWARE								
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION	38,000,000	1,429,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	---
	DIST OF COLUMBIA								
(SPEC)	METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON WATER SUPPLY	4,145,000	3,843,000	302,000	---	302,000	---	302,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	FLORIDA								
(N)	BISCAYNE BAY	2,412,000	80,000	---	---	230,000	---	---	---
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR	250,000	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA WATER SUPPLY	2,174,000	1,317,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(N)	CHARLOTTE HARBOR (PORT BOCA GRANDE)	418,000	6,000	45,000	---	45,000	---	45,000	---
(SP)	DADE COUNTY (NORTH OF HAULOVER PARK)	310,000	50,000	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
(N)	ESCAMBIA RIVER	438,000	---	---	---	105,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	GOLDEN GATE ESTATES	1,244,000	522,000	---	---	240,000	---	240,000	---
(N)	GULF COAST PASSES	465,000	245,000	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000	---
(SP)	INDIAN RIVER COUNTY	280,000	---	---	---	130,000	---	---	---
(N)	JUPITER INLET	293,000	---	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	KISSIMMEE RIVER	2,468,000	2,030,000	253,000	---	372,000	---	253,000	---
(N)	MANATEE HARBOR	305,000	65,000	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000	---
(N)	MEXICO BEACH INLET	202,000	72,000	---	---	110,000	---	---	---
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL	330,000	75,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR	170,000	35,000	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---
(SP)	PANAMA CITY BEACHES	2,820,000	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	---	---
(N)	PORT SUTTON CHANNEL	280,000	---	---	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	SIX MILE CYPRESS SLOUGH	403,000	59,000	---	---	150,000	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	SUWANEE RIVER	1,572,000	50,000	530,000	---	530,000	---	530,000	---
	GEORGIA								
(FDP)	BRUNSWICK	1,346,000	235,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	DALTON LAKE (PHASE I)	4,706,000	190,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN SAVANNAH	1,957,000	1,717,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHEAST GEORGIA REGION	1,300,000	125,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR COMPREHENSIVE	1,609,000	1,115,000	356,000	---	356,000	---	356,000	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR WIDENING	750,000	200,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	GUAM								
(N)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN THE TERRITORY OF GUAM............	3,200,000	2,341,000	525,000	---	525,000	---	525,000	---
	HAWAII								
(FDP)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN HAWAII..........................	3,600,000	2,457,000	510,000	---	660,000	---	510,000	---
(N)	HILO AREA COMPREHENSIVE STUDY.......................	1,300,000	1,157,000	143,000	---	143,000	---	143,000	---
	IDAHO								
(FDP)	COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID, OR, WA, & MT......	20,175,000	11,792,000	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER SNAKE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID & WY...........	7,085,000	3,376,000	680,000	---	680,000	---	680,000	---
	ILLINOIS								
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES.......................	720,000	98,000	263,000	---	263,000	---	263,000	---
(FDP)	CHICAGO - SOUTH END OF LAKE MICHIGAN, IL & IN..........	5,346,000	3,257,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	CHICAGOLAND UNDERFLOW PLAN, IL (PHASE I) (CUP).........	8,912,000	6,359,000	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---
(FDP)	FOX RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, IL & WI......................	2,196,000	1,728,000	433,000	---	433,000	---	433,000	---
(FC)	HARTWELL DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT...................	10,700,000	832,000	---	208,000	---	208,000	---	208,000
(FC)	HILLVIEW DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT...................	10,700,000	711,000	---	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000
(N)	ILLINOIS SHORE FROM WAUKEGAN TO ILLINOIS-WISCONSIN STATE LINE..	488,000	185,000	---	---	170,000	---	---	---
(SP)	ILLINOIS SHORE OF LAKE MICHIGAN.......................	1,516,000	296,000	---	---	440,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	MACKINAW RIVER..	869,000	55,000	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(FC)	MEREDOSIA LAKE AND WILLOW CREEK D & L DISTRICT........	8,600,000	430,000	---	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000
(FC)	MEREDOSIA, IL & MEREDOSIA, WILLOW CREEK & COON RUN D&L DIST..	10,100,000	510,000	---	222,000	---	222,000	---	222,000
(FDP)	MISS RIV, COON RAPIDS DAM TO OHIO RIVER, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI..	8,795,000	3,195,000	1,920,000	---	1,920,000	---	1,920,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FC)	MOLINE..	20,500,000	1,069,000	---	281,000	---	281,000	---	281,000
(FDP)	NORTH BRANCH OF CHICAGO RIVER (PHASE I)...............	3,290,000	215,000	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM STUDY, IL, IN, KY, OH, PA, & WV..	7,500,000	1,664,000	1,185,000	---	1,185,000	---	1,185,000	---
(FDP)	RICHLAND CREEK...	1,010,000	689,000	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---
(FC)	ROCK RIVER AGRICULTURAL LEVEES........................	30,100,000	630,000	---	68,000	---	68,000	---	68,000
	INDIANA								
(FDP)	CADY MARSH DITCH, GRIFFITH............................	120,000	45,000	---	---	75,000	---	75,000	---
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER..................................	1,200,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(COMP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN COMP. (AUTH. REPORTS), IN & IL.....	3,050,000	1,364,000	208,000	---	208,000	---	208,000	---
	KANSAS								
(FDP)	AR RIVER & TRIBS, GREAT BEND, KS TO TULSA.............	7,000,000	3,822,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	ARKANSAS RIV, GREAT BEND, KS TO TULSA, OK AT HALSTEAD.	694,000	150,000	290,000	---	290,000	---	290,000	---
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIV FROM GREAT BEND, KS TO JOHN MARTIN DAM...	3,390,000	2,323,000	320,000	---	320,000	---	320,000	---
(FC)	GREAT BEND LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT...................	39,400,000	873,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---
(FDP)	KANSAS AND OSAGE RIVERS...............................	5,240,000	4,192,000	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---
(FDP)	VERDIGRIS RIVER, KS & OK..............................	3,210,000	2,669,000	371,000	---	371,000	---	371,000	---
	KENTUCKY								
(N)	BIG SANDY RIVER, KY, WV, & VA.........................	3,600,000	2,112,000	230,000	---	230,000	---	230,000	---
(FC)	FALLS OF THE OHIO NATIONAL WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA, KY & IN..........................	680,000	---	---	---	---	75,000	---	---
(FC)	FRANKFORT (SOUTH FRANKFORT)...........................	4,730,000	170,000	---	92,000	---	92,000	---	92,000
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY & TN......................	1,300,000	808,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES........................	1,800,000	1,022,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(N)	LOWER CUMBERLAND - TENNESSEE RIVS BELOW BARKLEY CANAL.	1,445,000	895,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN..........................	3,069,000	1,069,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	LOUISIANA								
(FDP)	ALOHA - RIGOLETTE AREA................................	690,000	505,000	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA - TX SECTION, LA & TX..	3,760,000	1,644,000	499,000	---	499,000	---	499,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA................................	4,530,000	1,747,000	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	MERMENTAU, VERMILION, & CALCASIEU RVS & BAYOU TECHE...	5,420,000	877,000	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER GULF OUTLET (ENLARGEMENT)...........	11,900,000	835,000	3,000,000	---	5,200,000	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	WEST AGURS LEVEE......................................	800,000	257,000	---	63,000	---	63,000	---	63,000
	MAINE								
(N)	JONESPORT HARBOR......................................	8,500,000	215,000	---	---	---	25,000	---	---
(FDP)	SAINT JOHN RIVER......................................	3,522,000	1,068,000	380,000	---	380,000	---	380,000	---
	MARYLAND								
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR, MD & VA.............................	334,000,000	1,450,000	---	---	---	1,300,000	---	---
(SPEC)	CHESAPEAKE BAY STUDY, MD & VA.........................	36,388,000	29,771,000	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS								
(N)	EAST BOAT BASIN, SANDWICH.............................	375,000	240,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(COMP)	SOUTHEASTERN NEW ENGLAND AUTH REPORTS, MA, RI, & CT...	2,036,000	1,141,000	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000	---
	MICHIGAN								
(N)	GREAT LAKES CONNECT C & H,MI,IL,IN,MN,NY,OH,PA & WI...	4,930,000	3,046,000	925,000	---	925,000	---	925,000	---
(FDP)	GREAT LAKES, PARTICULARLY LAKE ONTARIO & LAKE ERIE....	9,751,000	8,356,000	219,000	---	219,000	---	219,000	---
(N)	MONROE HARBOR...	2,000,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FC)	RED RUN DRAIN AND LOWER CLINTON RIVER	125,000,000	3,771,000	---	85,000	---	85,000	---	85,000
(FDP)	SAGINAW RIVER	3,175,000	400,000	142,000	---	490,000	---	---	---
	MINNESOTA								
(FC)	BASSETT CREEK	12,500,000	1,215,000	---	385,000	---	385,000	---	385,000
(FC)	CHASKA	15,600,000	909,000	---	275,000	---	275,000	---	275,000
(FC)	EAST GRAND FORKS	11,200,000	483,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000
(FDP)	MINNESOTA RIVER VALLEY	9,080,000	2,898,000	395,000	---	840,000	---	840,000	---
(FDP)	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, MN & ND	7,300,000	5,137,000	793,000	---	793,000	---	793,000	---
(FC)	ROCHESTER	59,600,000	2,064,000	---	366,000	---	366,000	---	366,000
(FDP)	ST. CROIX RIVER, MN & WI	950,000	152,000	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---
	MISSISSIPPI								
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI GULF COASTAL AREA	1,974,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI SOUND AND ADJACENT AREAS, MS & AL	2,067,000	1,671,000	340,000	---	340,000	---	340,000	---
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR	1,160,000	632,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN	2,095,000	1,196,000	---	---	290,000	---	290,000	---
(FDP)	PEARL RIVER BASIN, MS & LA	4,050,000	3,041,000	400,000	---	725,000	---	725,000	---
(FDP)	SOWASHEE CREEK (PHASE I)	667,000	629,000	38,000	---	38,000	---	38,000	---
(SPEC)	TENNESSEE TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, MS, AL, TN, & KY	5,846,000	4,330,000	962,000	---	962,000	---	962,000	---
(N)	YAZOO RIVER	198,000,000	1,860,000	---	95,000	---	95,000	---	95,000
(N)	WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS	175,000	50,000	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---
	MISSOURI								
(FC)	HANNIBAL	625,000	161,000	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN	1,400,000	---	---	---	---	400,000	---	---
(FDP)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN WATER SUPPLY	600,000	---	---	---	600,000	---	---	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FDP)	ST LOUIS METROPOLITAN AREA, MO & IL....................	11,530,000	6,055,000	1,210,000	---	1,210,000	---	1,210,000	---
(FDP)	STE GENEVIEVE..	820,000	543,000	177,000	---	177,000	---	177,000	---
(FDP)	WHITE RIVER BASIN, COUNTY LINE LAKE....................	950,000	480,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	MONTANA								
(FDP)	MILK RIVER, HAVRE......................................	500,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
	NEVADA								
(FDP)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS..	1,550,000	1,370,000	180,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---
	NEW HAMPSHIRE								
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER, NH & ME.......	2,120,000	---	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	500,000
(FDP)	WINNIPESAUKEE RIVER....................................	683,000	413,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	NEW JERSEY								
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET (PHASE I)...............................	840,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	CAPE MAY INLET - LOWER TOWNSHIP (PHASE I)..............	202,000	96,000	---	---	106,000	---	---	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER IN THE VICINITY OF CAMDEN...............	5,080,000	70,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, NJ & NY........	4,320,000	450,000	1,750,000	---	1,750,000	---	1,750,000	---
(FDP)	PASSAIC RIVER BASIN STUDY, NJ & NY (PHASE I)..........	14,000,000	10,351,000	1,790,000	---	1,790,000	---	1,790,000	---
(FC)	RAHWAY RIVER BASIN, ROBINSON'S BRANCH AT RAHWAY.......	650,000	100,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	RAHWAY RIVER BASIN AT SPRINGFIELD......................	980,000	100,000	435,000	---	435,000	---	435,000	---
(FDP)	RARITAN RIVER BASIN....................................	4,163,000	2,979,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	NEW MEXICO								
(FC)	RIO GRANDE &TRIBS. (MIDDLE RIO GRANDE TO BELEN).......	2,300,000	---	---	---	---	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE & TRIBS (RIO PUERCO & RIO SALADO) (PHASE I)	1,930,000	1,870,000	60,000	---	60,000	---	60,000	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM & CO....................	7,700,000	4,408,000	620,000	---	620,000	---	620,000	---
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, TURTH OR CONSEQUENCES UNIT.......	1,100,000	345,000	---	---	---	---	---	250,000
	NEW YORK								
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL.....	667,000	282,000	187,000	---	187,000	---	187,000	---
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR..	2,000,000	965,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(N)	DANSVILLE...	1,000,000	465,000	---	---	---	25,000	---	---
(N)	JONES INLET AND FREEPORT LONG ISLAND..................	584,000	341,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	OSWEGO RIVER WATERSHED................................	3,454,000	2,919,000	450,000	---	450,000	---	450,000	---
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET, LONG ISLAND.........................	10,420,000	---	---	---	---	250,000	---	---
(N)	ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY, ADDITIONAL LOCKS.................	3,025,000	2,219,000	500,000	---	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	WESTCHESTER CO STREAMS, MAMARONECK & SHELDRAKE RIVERS.	3,800,000	100,000	455,000	---	455,000	---	455,000	---
	NORTH CAROLINA								
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER, ACME TO FAYETTEVILLE.................	790,000	165,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	LUMBER RIVER BASIN, NC & SC...........................	770,000	666,000	104,000	---	104,000	---	104,000	---
(FDP)	NEUSE RIVER...	1,962,000	662,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(SP)	WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET.................	763,000	295,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
	NORTH DAKOTA								
(FDP)	PEMBINA RIVER (PHASE I)...............................	1,480,000	1,249,000	231,000	---	231,000	---	231,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	OHIO								
(FDP)	BEAVER RIVER BASIN, OH & PA............................	1,575,000	828,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY....................................	3,400,000	2,315,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY AT LOGAN...........................	690,000	175,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY AT NELSONVILLE.....................	690,000	175,000	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR (PHASE I).............................	1,399,000	1,035,000	275,000	---	275,000	---	275,000	---
(FDP)	CUYAHOGA RIVER RESTORATION STUDY.......................	1,368,000	965,000	70,000	---	70,000	---	70,000	---
(N)	GALLIPOLIS LOCKS AND DAM, OH & WV......................	2,808,000	1,408,000	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---	1,400,000	---
(N)	GENEVA-ON-THE-LAKE.....................................	2,920,000	812,000	---	50,000	---	138,000	---	---
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR..	1,513,000	1,188,000	325,000	---	325,000	---	325,000	---
(FDP)	MIAMI RIVER, LITTLE MIAMI RIVER, AND MILL CREEK BASIN.	3,880,000	3,099,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	MIAMI RIVER BASIN SURVEY OF PLEASANT RUN IN VICINITY OF FAIRFIELD............................	670,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	MUSKINGUM RIVER..	1,775,000	1,349,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER BASIN AT MANSFIELD.....................	630,000	175,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER BASIN AT KILLBUCK......................	800,000	175,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FC)	RENO BEACH - HOWARD FARMS AREA.........................	2,620,000	260,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000
	OKLAHOMA								
(COMP)	ARKANSAS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, SOUTHCENTRAL AND SOUTHEAST AREAS OF OKLAHOMA..........................	500,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(N)	BIG AND LITTLE SALLISAW CREEKS.........................	3,800,000	235,000	---	135,000	---	135,000	---	135,000
(FDP)	CANADIAN RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, OK, TX, & NM............	3,200,000	1,466,000	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
(N)	CENTRAL OKLAHOMA PROJECT...............................	2,440,000	1,670,000	150,000	---	---	---	---	---
(FC)	PARKER LAKE, OK..	2,000,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FBP)	POTEAU RIVER, OK & AR..................................	1,500,000	1,026,000	370,000	---	370,000	---	370,000	---
(SPEC)	RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL SOLAR POND STUDIES OK & TX.	350,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	---	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FC)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, LA, ARK, OK & TX (INDEX ARK TO DENISON DAM)	183,000,000	105,000	---	---	---	350,000	---	---
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, WATER TREATMENT AND DISTRIBUTION	6,500,000	---	---	---	---	500,000	---	---
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, WATER TREATMENT AND DISTRIBUTION	20,700,000	---	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	---
	OREGON								
(N)	BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OR & WA	7,400,000	2,675,000	1,622,000	---	1,622,000	---	3,500,000	---
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER COAL EXPORT CHANNEL, OR & WA	2,000,000	530,000	500,000	---	665,000	---	665,000	---
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	564,000	509,000	55,000	---	55,000	---	55,000	---
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER AND BAR	524,000	250,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK & DAM (SECOND POWERHOUSE),PHASE I, OR & WA	3,500,000	1,500,000	1,800,000	---	1,800,000	---	1,800,000	---
(COMP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN	3,030,000	1,066,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	PENNSYLVANIA								
(FDP)	ALLEGHENY RIVER BASIN	2,250,000	100,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	DELAWARE RIVER BASIN STUDY, PA, NJ, NY, & DE	1,450,000	1,265,000	185,000	---	185,000	---	185,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER COMP. NAVIGATION STUDY, PA, NJ & DE	5,000,000	158,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER DREDGE DISPOSAL STUDY, PA, NJ, & DE	1,355,000	990,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM	70,800,000	1,259,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---	1,100,000
(FDP)	KISKIMINETAS RIVER BASIN	2,000,000	460,000	325,000	---	325,000	---	325,000	---
(FDP)	LEHIGH RIVER BASIN (HYDROPOWER) STUDY	1,796,000	655,000	290,000	---	290,000	---	290,000	---
(FDP)	MONONGAHELA-YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN, PA, WV & MD	6,500,000	3,292,000	750,000	---	750,000	---	900,000	---
(FC)	SUSQUEHANNA BASIN AT HARRISBURG	2,900,000	550,000	443,000	---	443,000	---	443,000	---
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE, PA (PHASE I)	---	950,000	---	---	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	TAMAQUA	7,965,000	525,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
(FDP)	WEST BRANCH SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, WILLIAMSPORT & S. WILLIAMSPORT	1,300,000	975,000	225,000	---	225,000	---	225,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	PUERTO RICO								
(FDP)	LA PLATA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES........................	910,000	328,000	280,000	---	280,000	---	280,000	---
(N)	PONCE HARBOR..	9,430,000	195,000	---	---	---	50,000	---	---
	RHODE ISLAND								
(N)	BRISTOL HARBOR......................................	3,900,000	292,000	---	30,000	---	30,000	---	30,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA								
(FDP)	GILLS CREEK...	1,382,000	442,000	455,000	---	455,000	---	455,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE PEE DEE & PEE DEE RIVERS, SC & NC..............	813,000	33,490	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(SP)	MYRTLE BEACH..	400,000	50,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	SOUTH DAKOTA								
(FDP)	EASTERN SOUTH DAKOTA & UPPER BIG SIOUX RIVER, SD & IA.	2,700,000	1,645,000	475,000	---	475,000	---	475,000	---
(MP)	GREGORY COUNTY PUMPED STORAGE.........................	---	---	---	---	---	---	1,000,000	---
(FDP)	MISSOURI RIVER, SD, NE, ND, & MT.......................	6,550,000	4,062,000	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
(MP)	SPRINGFIELD WATER INTAKE..............................	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	200,000
(FDP)	WESTERN DAKOTAS REGION OF SD..........................	2,035,000	894,000	380,000	---	380,000	---	380,000	---
	TENNESSEE								
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF NASHVILLE......................	2,974,000	2,354,000	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000	---
	TEXAS								
(FC)	BIG SANDY LAKE......................................	99,100,000	740,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000
(FDP)	BRAZOS NATURAL SALT POLLUTION CONTROL (PHASE I).......	1,800,000	1,583,000	217,000	---	217,000	---	217,000	---

ARKANSAS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AND RED RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE STUDIES

The Committee notes that the House Committee has recommended legislative authorization and appropriations for the Corps to undertake a comprehensive study of the regional economic development and water resource needs in south-central and southeastern Oklahoma.

The Committee is concerned that the study mandated by the House is excessively broad in scope and that there is no estimated cost of such an effort. Further, the Committee feels that the appropriate authorizing committees have had no opportunity to evaluate and consider such a study.

Therefore, the Committee has deleted, without prejudice, the legislative provision included in the bill and the $300,000 recommended to initiate the Arkansas River and tributaries, south-central and southeast areas of Oklahoma study; and the Red River Basin comprehensive study until such studies are authorized by the Congress.

NATCHEZ PORT AREA, MISS.

The Committee directs the Corps to use $50,000 of available funds to continue the Mississippi River East Bank-Warren to Wilkinson Counties (Natchez area) study in Mississippi. The project will provide additional flood free land for the existing Natchez Port facilities. While these facilities are located in Mississippi, they also serve regional needs of the area. In accordance with section 140 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976, economic analysis for the Natchez Port Area project should include regional economic development benefits for the purpose of computing the economic justification.

DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION

The Committee has deleted the $50,000 included in the budget for continued planning on the Delaware coast protection project. Since this project received construction funding in the fiscal year 1977 Public Works Appropriation Act, the Committee feels that funding should be included under the Construction, General appropriation account.

BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OREG.

The Committee has provided $3,500,000, the full capability of the Corps of Engineers, to advance by 1 year the completion date for planning and engineering design on a replacement for the existing inadequate Bonneville navigation lock on the Columbia River.

Given the critical need and urgency for a replacement lock and the fact that waterborne commerce on the Columbia-Snake navigation system will equal or exceed the capacity of Bonneville lock by 1988, the Committee urges the Corps of Engineers and the administration to include sufficient funding in future budgets to maintain the 1984 schedule for completion of planning which is contemplated by the Committee action.

PEARL RIVER BASIN, MISS.

In seeking a solution to the severe flood problems in the Pearl River Basin, the Corps of Engineers has made preliminary studies of the feasibility of constructing a "dry reservoir" (Shoccoe Dam) immediately upstream from the existing Ross Barnett Reservoir and Jackson, Miss. Such a project when operated in concert with the Ross Barnett project would provide a high level of flood protection to Jackson and downstream areas during periods of severe storms, and effectively carry out the flood control purposes of the Edinburg Lake project which was authorized for phase I planning by the Flood Control Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93–251). Corps studies to date have not yet established economic feasibility; however, the Corps has stated that the Shoccoe Dam would provide the most effective solution to the flood problems in the Jackson area. These studies have been based on limited available field data without detailed field investigations and do not provide an adequate basis for decision. The project has strong public support as an effective flood control measure and would also benefit fish and wildlife resources. The Committee desires that the Corps expedite its investigation of the Shoccoe Dam proposal and has provided additional funds to more accurately estimate costs and benefits, and provide a better basis for assessing the merits of this project prior to reporting on less effective alternative solutions.

MONONGAHELA AND YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN

The Committee is aware of the importance of Lock and Dam 7 and 8 on the Monongahela River to the transportation and commerce of western Pennsylvania. The Corps of Engineers contemplates completion of an interim report covering the replacement or modernization of Lock and Dam 7 and 8 in February 1984. The Committee has provided an additional $150,000 over the budget request to expedite the interim report on Lock and Dam 7 and 8 during the 1983 fiscal year.

PRESQUE ISLE, PA.

Noting the importance of a permanent solution to the beach erosion occurring at Presque Isle, Erie, Pa., the Committee has included $500,000 for continuation of engineering and design for permanent protective work for the beaches at Presque Isle.

SECTION 22, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The Committee is aware of the reservoir system model contemplated for the State of Mississippi and directs that the Corps of Engineers cooperate and provide technical assistance and funds which may be available for that purpose under section 22 of Public Law 93–251.

NATIONAL WATERWAYS STUDY

In view of the interest in and need to refurbish the Nation's transportation systems, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to transmit to the Congress by March 1, 1983, the National Waterways

Study which was initiated in 1976 by the Corps of Engineers to assess the needs and capabilities of the inland waterways in the United States. The Committee understands that the study is nearly complete and in order for the Congress to efficiently examine the needs for waterway improvements, such a study needs to be submitted to the Congress and evaluated.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1982	$1,429,992,000
Budget estimate, 1983	1,209,350,000
House allowance	1,252,857,000
Committee recommendation	1,233,100,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+23,750,000
House allowance	−19,757,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,233,100,000.

The following table shows each project for which funds are recommended. Immediately following the table, the Committee has outlined special reductions and changes made in the budgeted projects together with selected other Committee actions.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FDP)	BRAZOS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	8,350,000	5,666,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES	6,270,000	2,937,000	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK	62,900,000	2,418,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000
(FC)	COLORADO RIVER AND TRIBS, BOGGY CREEK	1,035,000	270,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	COLORADO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	4,300,000	3,624,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	DICKINSON BAYOU	964,000	50,000	100,000	---	300,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR (DEEPENING)	87,700,000	793,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(N)	GALVESTON BAY AREA	3,720,000	3,082,000	500,000	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	GUADALUPE AND SAN ANTONIO RIVERS	4,360,000	509,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS	1,025,000	80,000	190,000	---	190,000	---	190,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE CYPRESS CREEK, TX & LA	1,630,000	655,000	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000	---
(FC)	MILLICAN LAKE	264,000,000	3,325,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000
(N)	NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALT WATER BARRIER AT BEAUMONT	29,700,000	1,455,000	---	---	---	195,000	---	---
(FDP)	PINE ISLAND BAYOU WATERSHED	957,000	300,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(SP)	PLEASURE ISLAND AT PORT ARTHUR	840,000	65,000	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	RED RIVER & TRIBS ABOVE DENISON DAM, TX, OK, & NM	3,900,000	835,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JACINTO RIVER & TRIBS	3,120,000	1,577,000	350,000	---	400,000	---	350,000	---
(MP)	TRINITY RIVER	985,000,000	13,694,000	---	308,000	---	308,000	---	308,000
(FC)	UPPER WHITE OAK BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, VICINITY OF HOUSTON	3,040,000	330,000	570,000	---	570,000	---	570,000	---
	UTAH								
(FDP)	COLORADO RIVER & TRIBS, ABOVE LEE FERRY, UT, AZ, CO, NM & WY	3,000,000	1,159,000	310,000	---	310,000	---	310,000	---
(FDP)	JORDAN RIVER BASIN	1,900,000	1,300,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	VIRGINIA								
(FDP)	CHOWAN RIVER, VA & NC	2,255,000	1,570,000	412,000	---	412,000	---	412,000	---
(FC)	HAYSI LAKE	95,000,000	2,700,000	---	---	---	350,000	---	---
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR & CHANNELS DEEPENING	15,900,000	2,600,000	3,300,000	---	4,000,000	---	3,300,000	---
(FDP)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN	1,671,000	1,540,000	172,000	---	172,000	---	172,000	---
(FDP)	VIRGINIA BEACH (PHASE I)	1,360,000	952,000	408,000	---	408,000	---	408,000	---
(N)	YORK AND PAMUNKEY RIVERS	630,000	273,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	VIRGIN ISLANDS								
(FDP)	PUERTO RICO - VIRGIN ISLANDS PIPELINE STUDY, VI & PR	1,770,000	1,623,000	147,000	---	147,000	---	147,000	---
	WASHINGTON								
(N)	BLAIR AND SITCUM WATERWAYS	980,000	500,000	---	---	460,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	CHEHALIS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	2,527,000	2,172,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER AT SOUTH ABERDEEN AND COSMOPOLIS	1,050,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	MILL CREEK BASIN	829,000	129,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(COMP)	PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS	7,300,000	5,095,000	470,000	---	660,000	---	470,000	---
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR - DUWAMISH WATERWAY	2,712,000	2,532,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(N)	SNOHOMISH RIVER (NAVIGATION)	750,000	366,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT STUDY	1,908,000	478,000	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
	WEST VIRGINIA								
(FDP)	GUYANDOTTE RIVER BASIN, VICINITY OF LOGAN AND MULLENS	1,509,000	1,214,000	220,000	---	220,000	---	220,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION (WINFIELD L&D REPLACEMENT)	3,200,000	550,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(COMP)	KANAWHA BASIN COMPREHENSIVE STUDY	3,194,000	2,789,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	WISCONSIN								
(FDP)	WISCONSIN RIVER AT PORTAGE............................	842,000	692,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES..........................	21,500,000	935,000	---	202,000	---	202,000	---	202,000
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS								
	RESTUDY OF DEFERRED PROJECTS..........................	---	---	200,000	---	460,000	---	200,000	---
	LUKFATA LAKE, OK (HYDROPOWER STUDY)................	---	---	---	---	(260,000)	---	---	---
	REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECTS..........................	---	---	1,100,000	---	1,620,000	---	1,100,000	---
	HUGO LAKE, OK (HYDROPOWER STUDY)......................	---	---	---	---	(260,000)	---	---	---
	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK (HYDROPOWER STUDY).............	---	---	---	---	(260,000)	---	---	---
	TOTAL..			1,300,000	---	2,080,000	---	1,300,000	---
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES..............	---	---	5,270,000	---	5,625,000	---	5,625,000	---
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA								
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)................	---	---	470,000	---	470,000	---	470,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)......	---	---	295,000	---	295,000	---	295,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES...........................	---	---	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES.......................	---	---	6,000,000	---	6,050,000	---	6,000,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES....................................	---	---	240,000	---	240,000	---	240,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS..........	---	---	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
	COASTAL DATA COLLECTION...............................	---	---	1,530,000	---	1,530,000	---	1,530,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS................................	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES............................	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	TOTAL..			9,145,000	---	9,195,000	---	9,145,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	---	---	21,000,000	---	21,000,000	---	21,000,000	---
	SUBTOTAL			118,783,000	10,467,000	137,442,000	23,975,000	125,414,000	14,417,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGES	---	---	---	---	-2,638,000	---	-3,288,000	---
	TOTAL GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			129,250,000		158,779,000		136,543,000	

TYPE OF STUDY OR PROJECT:

(N)	NAVIGATION
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP)	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(FDP)	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(SP)	SHORELINE PROTECTION
(SPEC)	SPECIAL
(COMP)	COMPREHENSIVE
(PHASE I)	AUTHORIZD FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

12-313 O - 82 - 11

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	ALABAMA					
(MP)	JONES BLUFF LOCK & DAM..................................	84,600,000	83,500,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
(N)	TENNESSEE TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS.................	1,830,000,000	1,323,285,000	186,000,000	186,000,000	186,000,000
	ALASKA					
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES......................................	279,000,000	176,348,000	11,300,000	11,300,000	11,300,000
(MP)	SNETTISHAM 3RD POWER UNIT.............................	69,000,000	2,920,000	---	---	2,000,000
	ARIZONA					
(FC)	INDIAN BEND WASH......................................	31,400,000	24,596,000	6,000,000	7,019,000	6,000,000
(FC)	PHOENIX AND VICINITY (STAGE 2 & REMAINING WORK).......	321,000,000	21,917,000	4,000,000	4,560,000	4,000,000
	ARKANSAS					
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM LOCK & DAMS	543,000,000	533,194,000	5,002,000	5,002,000	5,002,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE HIGHWAY BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION..............	41,600,000	37,382,000	3,618,000	3,618,000	3,618,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA....................	278,000,000	174,418,000	20,400,000	20,400,000	20,400,000
	CALIFORNIA					
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR..................................	3,650,000	3,298,000	352,000	352,000	352,000
(FC)	CUCAMONGA CREEK.......................................	113,000,000	89,297,000	11,500,000	11,500,000	11,500,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL.............	315,000,000	243,787,000	12,300,000	15,800,000	12,300,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS......................	30,500,000	25,177,000	5,323,000	5,323,000	5,323,000
(FC)	LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER...............................	18,000,000	12,976,000	---	5,000,000	---
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE......................................	380,000,000	324,189,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT..............	110,000.000	45,167,000	700.000	1,000,000	700,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, CHICO LANDING TO RED BLUFF..........	12,900,000	5,745,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER & MAJOR AND MINOR TRIBUTARIES........	11,900,000	11,163,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON.........................	173,000,000	10,809,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	SAN JACINTO RIVER LEVEE AND BAUTISTA CREEK CHANNEL....	10,657,000	3,377,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(BE)	SURFSIDE - SUNSET AND NEWPORT BEACH (ORANGE COUNTY)...	24,500,000	---	---	300,000	---
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK..	78,600,000	32,191,000	6,300,000	6,300,000	6,300,000
	COLORADO					
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE..	93,200,000	86,535,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)..................	7,200,000	2,016,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
	CONNECTICUT					
(FC)	NEW LONDON HURRICANE BARRIER..........................	7,700,000	6,085,000	860,000	860,000	860,000
	DELAWARE					
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION (RESUMPTION)................	38,000,000	1,429,000	---	---	100.000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	DIST OF COLUMBIA					
(FC)	POTOMAC ESTUARY PILOT WATER TREATMENT PLANT...........	21,400,000	18,196,000	3,204,000	3,204,000	3,204,000
	FLORIDA					
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR......................................	31,500,000	5,962,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA..........................	1,460,000,000	260,256,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY...	49,800,000	33,239,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS.....................................	263,000,000	65,671,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR MAIN CHANNEL.............................	178,000,000	119,170,000	27,500,000	27,500,000	27,500,000
	GEORGIA					
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE FIFTH UNIT, GA & SC.....................	18,100,000	13,405,000	4,695,000	4,695,000	4,695,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE UPPER & LOWER DIVERSION DAMS (REHAB)....	9,900,000	3,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC..............	507,000,000	281,321,000	70,000,000	72,500,000	72,500,000
(MP)	WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, GA & AL................	31,100,000	3,800,000	7,375,000	7,375,000	7,375,000
	HAWAII					
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, OAHU............................	57,900,000	11,884,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
(N)	KAHULUI HARBOR, MAUI (REHAB)..........................	6,300,000	364,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	IDAHO					
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR..............................	329,000,000	320,374,000	2,050,000	2,050,000	2,050,000
(FC)	PLACER CREEK..	5,950,000	4,780,000	1,170,000	1,170,000	1,170,000
	ILLINOIS					
(FC)	EAST MOLINE...	9,680,000	8,450,000	1,230,000	1,230,000	1,230,000
(FC)	EAST ST. LOUIS AND VICINITY...........................	45,000,000	7,643,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
(FC)	FULTON..	18,400,000	16,675,000	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, STARVED ROCK L & D (REHAB).........	11,800,000	11,301,000	499,000	499,000	499,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, DRESDEN ISLAND L & D (REHAB).......	15,500,000	14,764,000	736,000	736,000	736,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, LOCKPORT L & D (REHAB).............	17,000,000	---	500,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	KASKASKIA ISLAND DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT..........	16,800,000	3,518,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION............................	162,600,000	122,191,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM NO. 26, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ALTON, IL & MO	776,000,000	146,057,000	68,200,000	68,200,000	68,200,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAM 53, IL & KY (REHAB).....................	6,300,000	3,157,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAM 52, IL & KY (REHAB).....................	9,900,000	7,601,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	MCGEE CREEK DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT...............	24,800,000	10,222,000	8,510,000	8,510,000	8,510,000
(FC)	MILAN...	13,900,000	4,008,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	ROCKFORD..	8,890,000	6,429,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(N)	SMITHLAND LOCKS AND DAM, IL, IN, & KY.................	276,700,000	265,446,000	3,450,000	3,450,000	3,450,000
(FC)	WOOD RIVER DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT................	18,700,000	15,355,000	900,000	900,000	900,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	INDIANA					
(FC)	EVANSVILLE	53,400,000	23,869,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
(FC)	LEVEE UNIT 5	8,480,000	6,890,000	1,040,000	1,040,000	1,040,000
	IOWA					
(FC)	BETTENDORF	14,500,000	1,327,000	2,440,000	2,440,000	2,440,000
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE	28,944,000	19,807,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
(FC)	LITTLE SIOUX RIVER	19,233,000	15,483,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	287,000,000	80,219,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE	105,050,000	96,422,000	1,960,000	1,960,000	1,960,000
(FC)	WATERLOO	52,300,000	44,647,000	1,253,000	1,253,000	1,253,000
	KANSAS					
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE	91,100,000	75,909,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
	KENTUCKY					
(FC)	BIG SOUTH FORK NAT'L RIVER & RECREATION AREA, KY & TN.	103,522,000	51,379,000	10,875,000	10,875,000	10,875,000
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE	79,900,000	69,505,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE	59,400,000	53,968,000	2,170,000	2,170,000	2,170,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE	61,000,000	45,457,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(FC)	SOUTHWESTERN JEFFERSON COUNTY..........................	68,700,000	35,753,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE....................................	99,400,000	69,112,000	13,750,000	13,750,000	13,750,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE......................................	90,700,000	13,0[illegible]4,000	---	8,000,000	8,000,000
	LOUISIANA					
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU AND TRIBUTARIES...........................	33,700,000	4,407,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	GRAND ISLE AND VICINITY (HURRICANE PROTECTION).........	9,400,000	750,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	700,000,000	129,564,000	18,800,000	18,800,000	18,800,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW (HURRICANE PROTECTION)........	60,900,000	16,532,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
(N)	LELAND BOWMAN LOCK (REPLACEMENT)......................	31,700,000	9,245,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET.......................	592,000,000	77,070,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO..	161,000,000	16,000,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
(FC)	MORGAN CITY AND VICINITY..............................	58,600,000	1,004,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE (HURRICANE PROTECTION)..........	171,000,000	44,954,000	3,450,000	3,450,000	3,450,000
(FC)	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, LA, AR, OK & TX..	61,500,000	46,448,000	---	4,000,000	---
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY - MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT..	1,404,000,000	373,871,000	30,000,000	35,000,000	40,000,000
	MARYLAND					
(FC)	BLOOMINGTON LAKE, MD & WV............................	174,300,000	172,792,000	1,508,000	1,508,000	1,508,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	MASSACHUSETTS					
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES (REHAB)................	25,200,000	24,440,000	1,735,000	1,735,000	1,735,000
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA.............	8,070,000	7,535,000	535,000	535,000	535,000
(N)	FALL RIVER HARBOR, MA & RI............................	62,200,000	1,325,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
(BE)	LYNN - NAHANT BEACH (REIMB)...........................	1,375,000	---	875,000	875,000	875,000
	MICHIGAN					
(FC)	SAGINAW RIVER...	138,000,000	21,830,000	2,385,000	2,385,000	2,385,000
	MINNESOTA					
(FC)	BIG STONE LAKE AND WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD...........	13,100,000	9,815,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(FC)	MANKATO & NORTH MANKATO...............................	96,500,000	43,500,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
(FC)	WINONA..	30,600,000	18,597,000	7,550,000	7,550,000	7,550,000
	MISSISSIPPI					
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL..............	151,000,000	11,414,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
(N)	YAZOO RIVER - BELZONI BRIDGE (ADVANCE PARTICIPATION)..	8,570,000	7,054,000	1,516,000	1,516,000	1,516,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	MISSOURI					
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY........................	141,000,000	4,245,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE...............	303,000,000	263,487,000	15,400,000	15,400,000	15,400,000
(MP)	HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR.....................	543,000,000	484,942,000	9,800,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES...............................	161,000,000	84,595,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER CHANNEL.............................	32,300,000	20,116,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE......................................	19,800,000	17,561,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO & MISSOURI RIVERS (REG WORKS)	231,000,000	93,946,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
(FC)	RY COUNTY DRAINAGE & LEVEE DISTRICTS, NO. 1, 2, & 3	8,760,000	6,720,000	1,840,000	1,840,000	1,840,000
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE...	79,300,000	76,500,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
	MONTANA					
(FC)	GREAT FALLS...	11,300,000	4,042,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(MP)	LIBBY ADDITIONAL UNITS................................	52,800,000	32,627,000	10,200,000	10,200,000	10,200,000
	NEBRASKA					
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES.................	51,200,000	28,678,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
	NEW JERSEY					
(FC)	ELIZABETH...	63,500,000	35,494,000	10,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	NEW YORK					
(N)	CATTARAUGUS HARBOR	4,500,000	3,300,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
(FC)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT	275,000,000	9,128,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(N)	NY HARBOR COLLECTION & REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY & NJ	58,800,000	10,029,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
	NORTH CAROLINA					
(N)	AIWW-REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES	66,700,000	6,932,000	4,550,000	4,550,000	4,550,000
(FC)	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE	143,000,000	91,707,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE	165,000,000	117,971,000	10,300,000	10,300,000	10,300,000
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY	114,000,000	4,531,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---
	NORTH DAKOTA					
(FC)	LAKE DARLING DAM	86,400,000	800,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	OHIO					
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE	56,700,000	54,468,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE	65,000,000	62,188,000	620,000	620,000	620,000
(FC)	CHILLICOTHE	22,100,000	20,054,000	2,046,000	2,046,000	2,046,000
(FC)	CUYAHOGA RIVER BASIN (BIG CREEK) FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT	23,000,000	1,107,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	MILL CREEK	249,000,000	11,112,000	10,400,000	10,400,000	10,400,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)..........	94,900,000	2,400,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES (REHAB).........................	78,800,000	13,870,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
(FC)	NEWARK...	10,800,000	4,839,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	POINT PLACE..	8,900,000	1,699,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
(N)	WEST HARBOR..	3,150,000	2,835,000	315,000	315,000	315,000
	OKLAHOMA					
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE...	92,000,000	33,335,000	22,600,000	22,600,000	22,600,000
(FC)	COPAN LAKE...	72,000,000	76,772,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE..	54,900,000	51,087,000	1,200,000	2,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE..	112,000,000	80,165,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	OREGON					
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA................	662,000,000	581,636,000	26,400,000	26,400,000	26,400,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, SOUTH JETTY (REHAB)......	3,160,000	2,700,000	460,000	460,000	460,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE (RESUMPTION)..........................	142,000,000	10,318,000	---	---	5,000,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, LAKE UMATILLA, OR & WA.........	517,000,000	483,197,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA...	29,100,000	12,875,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER AND BAR (CONTINUATION)..................	42,500,000	1,484,000	---	---	4,000,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION................	34,600,000	21,547,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, HEPPNER............................	37,000,000	26,426,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	PENNSYLVANIA					
(N)	EMSWORTH LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER (REHAB)............	36,000,000	16,215,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000
(FC)	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA & NY (REHAB)...	6,000,000	350,000	5,050,000	5,050,000	5,050,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE..	13,646,000	8,546,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	600,000
(FC)	TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES...............................	192,700,000	185,900,000	---	3,470,000	---
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY (REMEDIAL WORK)......................	29,400,000	14,025,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
	PUERTO RICO					
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS.........................	295,000,000	60,136,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA					
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR.....................	161,000,000	136,040,000	19,940,000	19,940,000	19,940,000
(N)	LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC.........................	18,300,000	10,719,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000
	TEXAS					
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE..	50,000,000	42,457,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL (AREA VIII)	52,800,000	39,571,000	5,100,000	5,100,000	5,100,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS............................	169,000,000	22,653,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT)...............	87,600,000	22,984,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	EL PASO...	74,000,000	37,879,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(FC)	HIGHLAND BAYOU..	19,500,000	11,834,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	LAKEVIEW LAKE...	220,000,000	102,288,000	27,800,000	27,800,000	27,800,000
(N)	MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER..........................	29,900,000	2,020,000	---	3,000,000	---
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE......................................	286,100,000	28,395,000	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT......................	70,500,000	35,018,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
(FC)	SAN GABRIEL RIVER.....................................	146,000,000	99,252,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU..	73,000,000	2,843,000	1,700,000	2,700,000	1,700,000
(FC)	TEXAS CITY AND VICINITY (HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION)..	37,600,000	34,730,000	2,870,000	2,870,000	2,870,000
(FC)	THREE RIVERS...	5,890,000	5,891,000	769,000	769,000	769,000
(FC)	VINCE AND LITTLE VINCE BAYOUS.........................	18,100,000	6,868,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	VIRGINIA					
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (1962 MODIFICATION) (REIMB)........	5,500,000	3,110,000	380,000	380,000	380,000
	WASHINGTON					
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM ADDITIONAL UNITS......................	362,000,000	307,334,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL (REHAB).....................	7,850,000	1,200,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA & ID...................	321,600,000	319,117,000	2,403,000	2,403,000	2,403,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR & ID..	181,000,000	47,430,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE (REHAB)...............................	15,400,000	9,756,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	WEST VIRGINIA					
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE......................................	47,300,000	36,992,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE......................................	54,500,000	50,595,000	2,850,000	2,850,000	2,850,000
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORK OF BIG SANDY AND CUMBERLAND RIVERS, WV, VA & KY..............................	702,000,000	12,500,000	---	8,000,000	16,400,000
(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE......................................	193,000,000	185,322,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE...............................	201,000,000	62,975,000	16,200,000	16,200,000	16,200,000
	WISCONSIN					
(FC)	LA FARGE LAKE..	72,000,000	18,092,000	---	550,000	550,000
(FC)	PRAIRIE DU CHIEN.....................................	4,020,000	3,859,000	161,000	161,000	161,000
	MISCELLANEOUS					
	SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)...............	---	---	12,000,000	14,158,000	12,000,000
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES ATTRIBUTABLE TO NAV PROJ (SECTION 111)......................................	---	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	SMALL BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)....	---	---	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000
	SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD CONTROL & RELATED PURPOSES (SECTION 205)......................................	---	---	17,000,000	17,350,000	20,000,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC 14)..	---	---	4,000,000	5,000,000	4,000,000
	SMALL SNAGGING & CLEARING PROJECTS (SECTION 208)......	---	---	300,000	300,000	300,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	RECREATION FACILITIES AT COMPLETED PROJECTS...........	---	---	4,700,000	5,400,000	4,700,000
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT)......................	---	---	4,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
	EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION................................	---	---	7,851,000	7,851,000	7,851,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE........	---	---	-62,146,000	-73,846,000	-91,146,000
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL..........................			1,209,350,000	1,252,857,000	1,233,100,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N)	NAVIGATION
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP)	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(FDP)	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(SP)	SHORELINE PROTECTION
(SPEC)	SPECIAL
(COMP)	COMPREHENSIVE
(PHASE I)	AUTHORIZD FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, ALABAMA, MISSISSIPPI

The 234-mile Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway will connect the Upper Mississippi, the Ohio and mid-America's 16,000 miles of other navigable waterways with ports along the Gulf of Mexico. When completed, it will provide direct benefits from transportation savings to a 22-State area of America's heartland. This alternate and shorter slack water artery for shippers will cut the distance from some major inland ports to the Gulf by more than 800 miles. The nearly-completed waterway extends from Demopolis, Ala., on the existing navigable Black Warrior-Tombigbee system via the Tombigbee then through a 175-foot high divide which separates the two river basins and into Pickwick Lake on the Tennessee River.

Although this new waterway is nearly completed, it appears that its opponents will continue their vigorous campaign to have the Senate terminate funding of the remaining construction items. In recommending completion of the authorized project, the Committee offers these facts for the Senate's consideration.

—The estimated Federal, Corps of Engineers cost of the authorized project is $1.83 billion, not the "over $2½ to $3 billion or even $4 billion" often asserted by opponents and frequently quoted in the news media.

—$1.512 billion of the $1.83 billion had been committed as of September 30, 1982.

—$1.329 billion has been spent as of September 30, 1982.

—The President's budget request for fiscal year 1983 is $186 million.

—Practically every inch of the waterway is already completed or under construction.

—Because of the advanced stage of construction and recent contractual agreements, the Corps estimates that the project will be complete for through navigation in September 1985, 1 year earlier than previously scheduled.

—Construction of the navigation features are 82 percent completed with all major contracts already completed, underway, or awarded.

—Eight of the 10 locks and dams are finished or virtually finished, with the remaining 2 about a third completed and to be finished in mid-1984.

—The massive 27-mile divide cut, to link up the Tombigbee with the Tennessee River, will be nearly completed this year.

—Over 159 miles of the total 234 miles are complete. All other channels and work in the canal section are under construction.

—Essentially all project land has been acquired.

—To complete navigation features and open the waterway to commercial navigation will cost $387 million; to terminate and mothball the project is estimated to cost $431 million.

—To terminate would forfeit and waste most of the $1.33 billion already spent to date.

—Up to 5,000 people would be added to unemployment rolls if terminated.

—A completed waterway will provide a needed economic stimulus for the Nation, particularly in the waterway corridor to the Port of Mobile and into the heartland of mid-America.

—The benefit-cost ratio based on remaining costs is about 3.5 to 1.

—Waterway completion will produce annual navigation benefits of over $130 million, nearly $7 billion over the 50-year project economic life.

—Environmental impacts have already occurred at this stage of the project, but design and construction changes which were made to minimize potential adverse impacts and continued ongoing efforts to minimize and mitigate potential losses would be lost and halted if terminated.

—This is the first major national waterway to be constructed entirely in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act. It has been the most studied and monitored of any Federal project for environmental compliance, with many changes incorporated based on environmental considerations by environmental experts who monitored and made recommendations. As such, the project has been recognized and judged a standard setter, a benchmark in setting standards for environmentally sound construction activities of this nature. When carefully considered and examined, it is clear that the project work is unique in regard to the steps that were taken for environmental protection and enhancement in many aspects.

In light of these factors, and with careful consideration of all views brought to our attention, the inescapable conclusion is that there is no rational environmental or economic basis to recommend termination of project funding. In summary, the cost remaining to complete the navigation portion of this project is just over $380,000,000. The cost to terminate and mothball the project is estimated to be $431,000,000, but this action would forfeit most of the $1,330,000,000 allocated to date. Project completion will provide a needed first-class addition to the inland waterway system, producing annual navigation benefits of over $130,000,000, nearly $7,000,000,000 over the 50-year project economic life. All major project features are complete or substantially underway and construction has occurred along the entire 234-mile length of the waterway. While there may be valid disagreement over the significance of potential adverse environmental impacts, project construction and work completed are at such an advanced stage that it would be environmentally irresponsible to abandon the project.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $186,000,000, the full amount requested by the President.

MIAMI HARBOR, BAY FRONT PARK, FLA.

The Committee has included $800,000 for the Miami Harbor, Bay Front Park, Fla. project under recreation facilities at completed projects. The Committee intends to fully fund the Bay Front Park project in Miami, Fla. in subsequent years to an amount that is equal to the appraised value of the land that will be deeded to the Corps of Engineers by the city of Miami for the project.

AUXILIARY FISHWAY WATER SUPPLY POWER UNITS

In the view of the Committee, Public Law 79–14 and Public Law 81–516 authorizes the Corps of Engineers to provide power facilities in the existing north shore auxiliary fishway attraction water system at McNary Dam and the Dalles Dam. Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps to use $250,000 for each project, from within available funds, to complete final engineering and design of the auxiliary fishway power units.

AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL PROGRAM

An amount of $5,000,000 is recommended by the Committee for the Aquatic Plant Control program. The funds included provide for greater emphasis in South Carolina, Florida, Louisiana, California, Oregon, and other critical needs nationwide.

SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

The Committee allowance includes funds for the Tualatin River channel improvement flood control project in Oreg., and for the preparation of a detailed project report on the Pearl-Flowood, Rankin County, Miss. project.

RED RIVER WATERWAY, LA.

The Committee has been informed that the contract for construction of Lock and Dam 2 has been awarded and that completion of the contract is scheduled for early fiscal year 1987. With the completion of Lock and Dam 2, navigation on the Red River Waterway will be available through Pool No. 2 if, and only if, the stabilization and realinement work on Pools No. 1 and 2 is accomplished during the next 4 years. Therefore, the Committee has included $40,000,000 for continuing construction of Locks and Dams No. 1 and 2, channel realinement and stabilization, and other associated work. These funds and continued funding of this work over the next several years will provide for achieving project benefits and prevention of unnecessary cost increases to the Federal Government which would occur if development of the planned navigation channel would be accomplished by dredging.

MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, N.C.

The Committee is aware that the Corps of Engineers has determined that a reanalysis of the economic justification of the Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay, N.C. project is needed because the 1975 economic study conducted by the Corps contained fundamental errors which resulted in a substantial overstatement of the project's benefits.

In accomplishing the reanalysis, the Corps is directed to evaluate and determine the feasibility and sufficiency of performing maintenance dredging to accomplish a reasonably consistent and reliable 14-foot channel through Oregon Inlet. Specifically, the Corps is directed to display a comparison between the 14-foot dredging program, the authorized jetty project, and the dredging-only alternative in light of new information that is now available.

Further, the Committee cautions the Corps to undertake the reanalysis in such a way that the new economic evaluation is not influenced by prior work and conclusions, thereby avoiding mistakes made on earlier studies.

SIUSLAW RIVER AND BAR, OREG.

Congress in the River and Harbor Flood Control Act of 1958, Public Law 85–500, authorized the construction of navigation improvement for the Siuslaw River in Oregon. The basis of that congressional project authorization was House Document No. 204, 85th Congress, 1st session which included the extension of the north jetty at Siuslaw River and Bar, but recommended jetty construction be postponed until experience demonstrated that the work was adivisable. The House document went on to state "the extension should be included in the proposed modification so additional congressional authorization would not be needed in the event that dredging alone proves impractical."

Observation made at the entrance channel after project completion in 1968 indicated the inability to maintain authorized depths through dredging only. Accordingly, a reanalysis was undertaken to determine optimum jetty lengths needed to maintain channel depths. These studies completed in June 1976 indicated the deferred authorized jetty extension should be carried out to at least the 25-foot contour to maintain channel depths and that jetties should be of equal length.

Based on the Report of the Division Engineer, North Pacific Division, dated June 16, 1976, and the continued existence of hazardous entrance conditions, the Congress in Public Law 96–367 directed the Corps of Engineers to use funds appropriated for the Siuslaw River and Bar project to design and construct further modifications.

Due to a change in the appropriation structure for engineering and design, funds to continue advanced engineering and design were inadvertently included under General, Investigations account.

The action recommended by the Committee corrects that oversite and provides $4,000,000 to continue the Siuslaw River and Bar modifications as authorized.

HEMPSTEAD HARBOR, N.Y.

Within funds available and consistent with appropriate cost sharing, the Corps is directed to use up to $1,000,000 to remove sources of drift and debris in Hempstead Harbor, N.Y.

LEVISA AND TUG FORK OF BIG SANDY AND CUMBERLAND RIVERS, W. VA. AND KY.

The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to proceed as rapidly as possible with planning, engineering, land acquisition, and construction of the projects authorized by section 202 of Public Law 96–367.

With respect to the Tug Fork Valley, the Corps is directed to proceed to implement those measures, structural and nonstructural, identified in the F–1 plan as prepared by the Huntington district office.

With respect to the Levisa Fork and Upper Cumberland areas, the Corps is directed to proceed with planning, engineering, land acquisition, and construction of all necessary structural and nonstrucutral measures provided for by the original project authorization and in all cases, including the Tug Fork Valley, providing standard project flood level of protection.

The Corps should proceed with all planning efforts for those areas not presently affored flood protection or for which such plans have not previously been completed.

SNETTISHAM HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT, ALASKA

The Committee has included $2,000,000 for continued construction of power unit 3 at the Snettisham project in Alaska. The Committee also wishes to point out that the $2,000,000 appropriated last year for project construction has not been utilized as envisioned by the Congress.

Therefore, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers to follow congressional direction regarding innovative financing and proceed with construction of the third power unit as intended by Congress, to allocate from within available resources the $2,000,000 provided for fiscal 1982, and to proceed with the award of those construction contracts required for orderly and timely project completion.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA.

The Committee urges the Corps of Engineers to work with authorities in Elbert County, Ga. in an effort to accomplish appropriate road restoration work necessitated by construction activities at the Richard B. Russell Dam and Lake project.

STONINGTON HARBOR, MAINE

The Committee allowance includes funds for the Stonington Harbor, Maine, section 107, small navigation project.

The Committee concurs with the House Committee recommendations regarding the Kaulana Bay and the Paauau Stream, Hawaii projects.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Appropriations, 1982	$256,310,000
Budget estimate, 1983	282,000,000
House allowance	305,090,000
Committee recommendation	285,564,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+3,564,000
House allowance	−19,526,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $285,564,000, which is $19,526,000 below the House allowance and $3,564,000 over the budget request.

The Committee is aware of the need to identify remedial measures for flood control, bank stabilization, sedimentation, and related purposes along Homochitto and Buffalo Rivers, St. Catherine and Coles

Creeks, Bayou Pierre, and other major tributaries draining into the Mississippi River between Bayou Pierre and the Buffalo River, Miss. Accordingly, the Corps may use $50,000 from funds available in this account to undertake a reconnaissance study of appropriate remedial actions.

The Committee allowance also includes $100,000 to continue the Larto Lake-Saline Lake area, La. study.

The following table shows the distribution of the funds recommended with the budget request and the House allowance for activities and projects under this heading.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS				
SURVEYS:				
GENERAL STUDIES:				
BOEUF-TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA	5,720,000	595,000	595,000	595,000
HELENA & VICINITY, AR	670,000	65,000	65,000	65,000
ST. FRANCIS RIVER BASIN BELOW WAPPAPELLO LAKE, AR & MO	3,160,000	425,000	425,000	425,000
WEST MEMPHIS, AR	975,000	108,000	108,000	108,000
MAYFIELD CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, KY	810,000	217,000	217,000	217,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN (WATER & LAND RESOURCES), LA	6,210,000	310,000	310,000	310,000
ST. JOHN'S BAYOU AND NEW MADRID FOODWAY, MO (PHASE I)	1,216,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
YAZOO RIVER BASIN, MS	8,190,000	985,000	985,000	985,000
WOLF & LOOSAHATCHIE RIVER & NONCONNAH CREEK, TN	1,635,000	64,000	64,000	64,000
LARTO LAKE-SALINE LAKE AREA, LA	1,290,000	---	---	100,000
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA	---	260,000	260,000	260,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:				
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION SALINITY CONTROL STRUCTURE, LA	32,300,000	---	1,400,000	---
L'ANGUILLE RIVER BASIN, AR	22,600,000	200,000	550,000	200,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		3,829,000	5,579,000	3,929,000
CONSTRUCTION				
REELFOOT LAKE - NO. 9, KY & TN	10,410,000	170,000	170,000	170,000
MUD LAKE PUMPING STATION, TN	5,230,000	325,000	325,000	325,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MO, MS, & TN	1,725,000,000	31,000,000	32,340,000	31,000,000
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MO, MS, & TN	5,206,000,000	51,800,000	51,800,000	51,800,000
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA (RESUMPTION)	39,500,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
OLD RIVER, LA	383,000,000	54,800,000	54,800,000	54,800,000
LOWER RED RIVER-SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA	47,200,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA	2,800,000,000	28,300,000	32,300,000	28,300,000
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO	389,000,000	5,730,000	5,730,000	5,730,000
TECHE-VERMILION BASINS (ADDL SURFACE WATER SUPPLY),LA.	35,700,000	2,271,000	2,271,000	2,271,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA:	(655,000,000)	(20,300,000)	(25,300,000)	(20,300,000)
BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, EXCEPT LAKE CHICOT PUMPING PLANT..................................	---	800,000	800,000	800,000
BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, LAKE CHICOT PUMPING PLANT	---	17,780,000	17,780,000	17,780,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, EXCEPT TENSAS COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT..................................	---	1,610,000	1,610,000	1,610,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, TENSAS COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT..	---	110,000	5,110,000	110,000
TENSAS RIVER NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, LA.............	40,000,000	---	5,000,000	10,000,000
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN........................	115,000,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(1,616,000,000)	(15,500,000)	(16,750,000)	(15,500,000)
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, ETC..........................	---	5,132,000	5,132,000	5,132,000
GREENWOOD..	---	100,000	100,000	100,000
MAIN STEM..	---	2,518,000	2,518,000	2,518,000
TRIBUTARIES:				
EXCEPT ASCALMORE-TIPPO AND OPOSSUM BAYOUS.......	---	2,761,000	3,011,000	2,761,000
ASCALMORE-TIPPO AND OPPOSUM BAYOUS..............	---	145,000	1,145,000	145,000
UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS (FORMERLY AUXILIARY CHANNEL).	---	4,075,000	4,075,000	4,075,000
YAZOO BACKWATER..................................	---	769,000	769,000	769,000
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION..........................		213,496,000	230,086,000	223,496,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1982	$1,025,355,000
Budget estimate, 1983	1,011,000,000
House allowance	1,150,996,000
Committee recommendation	1,137,928,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+126,928,000
House allowance	−13,068,000

An appropriation of $1,137,928,000 is recommended, which is $13,068,000 below the House allowance and $126,928,000 above the budget request.

The funds provided are for maintenance and operation of projects already constructed so full value can be obtained from the public's prior investment. In fiscal year 1982, the Corps of Engineers will operate and maintain 325 navigation projects, 267 flood control reservoir and local protection projects, and 72 multipurpose projects with power.

The Committee is aware of growing operation and maintenance requirements nationwide, and the continuously changing needs and priorities. It is often necessary to accomplish work scheduled for the budget year in the current year, and it is not uncommon for the Corps to divert operation and maintenance funds to unscheduled emergency maintenance requirements.

Last year, the operation and maintenance requirements of the Corps of Engineers exceeded the $1.0 billion level for the first time. The Committee is aware of the efforts of the Corps to stretch the scarce O. & M. dollars to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of methods. As more and more projects come into the inventory and fiscal constraints reduce budgetary resources, it is clear that the Corps will need to change its traditional approach to undertaking the required O. & M. work nationwide. Adjustments in lower priority programs and noncritical work should be considered. However, in optimizing its use of the limited resources available, the Corps should insure maximum public benefits for navigation, hydropower, and flood control.

The Committee is aware that limitations on available funds and manpower resources over the next several years could require reductions in the program for construction, and operation and maintenance of recreation facilities at Corps of Engineers projects. However, the Committee feels that substantial benefits are derived from these public use facilities and that additional emphasis should be placed on those recreational areas where local economic and unemployment conditions could be benefited. Accordingly, the Committee has included in the amount recommended an additional $4,000,000 and directs the Corps of Engineers to utilize those funds to maximize the recreational benefits at projects nationwide.

In light of the increasing O. & M. requirements and limited budgetary resources, the Committee must again state its strong preference not to make specific allocations to individual projects. The 1983 budget request was based on estimates which were developed 18 months ago. Maintenance dredging requirements in navigation channels vary with weather conditions, equipment availability, and usage. Further, good bid experience could free-up additional dollars to accomplish unscheduled work. Therefore, specific allocations impede the Corps' ability to adjust to continuously changing needs. Only if the Corps' financial flexibility to respond to emergencies and other unanticipated urgent requirements is preserved can the Chief of Engineers carry out his responsibility to perform the O. & M. work of greatest overall importance to the Nation.

The attention of the Corps is directed to the following projects in need of maintenance and for which the Committee has received testimony and funding requests—the need for maintenance dredging at the several Oregon coastal ports and Dunkirk Harbor, N.Y., to eliminate hazardous navigation conditions.

ILLINOIS WATERWAY, ILL.

In providing appropriations for fiscal year 1982, the House Committee included language, enacted in Public Law 97-88, to clarify the responsibilities of the Corps of Engineers for operations and maintenance of the Illinois Waterway, particularly with respect to the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal which heretofore has been operated and maintained by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago (MSD). The intent was to make it clear to the Corps of Engineers that its historic responsibilities for navigation on the Illinois Waterway encompassed the entire waterway from Grafton, Ill., on the Mississippi River to Chicago Harbor on Lake Michigan, and that local interests (MSD) would be responsible for sharing in costs of features that also served sanitation or other local purposes as determined to be appropriate. The Corps of Engineers now finds that according to its reports, the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal starts at Damen Avenue in Chicago and therefore does not include the controlling works and lock in the Chicago River which provides the connection for navigation into Chicago Harbor on Lake Michigan.

The Committee is aware of ongoing negotiations between the Corps of Engineers and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago (MSD). While the discussions between the two parties have not always been fruitful, the Committee believes the progress to date provides a sound basis for continuing the negotiations.

In light of these ongoing discussions between the Corps and MSD, the Committee is reluctant to interject new guidance that could jeopardize the negotiations. However, based on the House Committee action, the Committee feels that some general clarification is in order.

First, the Committee notes that there is basic agreement on four of the eight items under negotiation; namely, removal of Butterfly Dam, drift and debris removal, and operation and maintenance of bridges over the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal. The fourth item, operation of the Chicago River Control Structure and Lock, while a component of the Illinois Waterway, was not within the geographical limits established by Public Law 97-88. The Committee does, however, concur with the House action which brings this facility within the definition of the Illinois Waterway.

The remaining items involve judgment factors for determining an appropriate sharing of costs based on the Federal interest in navigation and the local purposes that would be served.

This Committee believes that the concepts outlined in the House Committee report provide a reasonable basis for the Corps of Engineers to reach agreement with the Metropolitan Sanitary District and that the local level of cost sharing on features that serve navigation should be negotiable and not absolute as long as the overall interest to the public is best served.

Given the policy aspects involved, the Committee expects the Office of the Chief of Engineers to work closely with the District personnel and local interest in resolving the remaining issues.

KAWKAWLIN RIVER, MICH.

The Committee takes exception to and does not concur with the House Committee report language regarding the operation and maintenance of the Kawkawlin River, Michigan, project. The Committee notes that the local sponsors agreed to operate and maintain the project as a precondition to its accomplishment.

The following table is included for illustrative purposes only and shows the estimated work allowances for fiscal year 1983:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
	ALABAMA	
(N)	ALABAMA-COOSA RIVERS	3,666,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR & TOMBIGBEE RIVERS	8,656,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	2,541,000
(MP)	JONES BLUFF LOCK & DAM	2,882,000
(MP)	MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM-WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAKE.	3,497,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR	3,721,000
(N)	PERDIDO PASS CHANNEL	226,000
(N)	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	55,000
(N)	TENNESSEE TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	8,706,000
(MP)	WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK & DAM, AL & GA	3,646,000
	ALASKA	
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR	1,221,000
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES	578,000
(N)	DILLINGHAM SMALL BOAT HARBOR	422,000
(N)	KETCHIKAN BAR PT. S.B.H	22,000
(N)	HOMER HARBOR	265,000
(N)	NINILCHIK SMALL BOAT HARBOR	238,000
(N)	NOME HARBOR	508,000
(N)	STIKINE RIVER SNAGGING	24,000
	ARIZONA	
(FC)	ALAMO DAM	499,000
(FC)	PAINTED ROCK DAM	674,000
(FC)	WHITLOW RANCH DAM	120,000
	ARKANSAS	
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE	1,861,000
(MP)	BLAKELY MOUNTAIN DAM, LAKE OUACHITA	2,595,000
(FC)	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE	644,000
(MP)	BULL SHOALS LAKE	4,676,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK & DAM	3,283,000
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE	2,566,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE	526,000
(FC)	DIERKS LAKE	547,000
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE	480,000
(MP)	GREERS FERRY LAKE	3,051,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR	225,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM LOCK & DAMS, AR & OK	14,346,000
(FC)	MILLWOOD LAKE	1,108,000
(MP)	NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON	2,068,000
(FC)	NIMROD LAKE	777,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE	2,557,000
(N)	OSCEOLA HARBOR	570,000
(N)	OUACHITA & BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	4,622,000
(MP)	OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK & DAM	3,201,000
(N)	WHITE RIVER	1,355,000
	CALIFORNIA	
(FC)	BLACK BUTTE LAKE	1,399,000
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM - H. V. EASTMAN LAKE	935,000
(N)	CHANNEL ISLANDS HARBOR	1,800,000
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR	811,000
(FC)	COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO)	1,318,000
(N)	DRIFT REMOVAL (SF HARBOR AND BAY)	1,553,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE & CHANNEL	930,000
(FC)	FARMINGTON DAM	125,000
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE	910,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR & BAY	2,433,000
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE	2,200,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA	6,661,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH HARBORS (MODEL)	120,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP	120,000
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM	1,716,000
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR	2,000,000
(N)	MOSS LANDING HARBOR	59,000
(FC)	NEW HOGAN LAKE	905,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE (DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL)	450,000
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR	381,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR	1,072,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR	1,088,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR SAND BYPASS SYSTEM	4,500,000
(FC)	PINE FLAT LAKE	1,238,000
(N)	REDWOOD CITY HARBOR	2,394,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR	1,905,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER & TRIBS (DEBRIS CONTROL)	665,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FT. PROJECT)	1,831,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL	464,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY	400,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR	1,335,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE	932,000
(N)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	2,700,000
(N)	SAN PABLO BAY & MARE ISLAND STRAIT	4,972,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN	2,000,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR	950,000
(N)	SANTA CRUZ HARBOR	306,000
(FC)	SUCCESS LAKE	885,000
(N)	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL	654,000
(FC)	TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH)	905,000
(N)	VENTURA MARINA	2,500,000
(N)	YUBA RIVER	25,000

COLORADO

Type of project	Project title	Allowance
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE	227,000
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE	412,000
(FC)	CHERRY CREEK LAKE	797,000
(FC)	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR	594,000
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE	479,000

CONNECTICUT

Type of project	Project title	Allowance
(FC)	BLACK ROCK LAKE	191,000
(FC)	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE	167,000
(N)	CONNECTICUT RIVER BELOW HARTFORD	1,070,000
(FC)	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE	80,000
(FC)	HOP BROOK LAKE	342,000
(N)	HOUSATONIC RIVER, CT & MA	643,000
(FC)	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE	226,000
(N)	NEW HAVEN HARBOR	1,760,000
(FC)	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE	141,000
(FC)	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER	108,000
(FC)	THOMASTON DAM	249,000
(FC)	WEST THOMPSON LAKE	671,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
	DELAWARE	
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE & MD..	10,985,000
(N)	IWW REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY......................	60,000
(N)	NANTICOKE RIVER....................................	711,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR..................................	1,401,000
	DIST OF COLUMBIA	
(N)	POTOMAC & ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL)............	536,000
	FLORIDA	
(N)	APALACHICOLA BAY...................................	59,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR...................................	1,948,000
(FC)	CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA.........................	4,780,000
(N)	CHARLOTTE HARBOR...................................	716,000
(N)	CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL..........................	906,000
(N)	EAST PASS CHANNEL..................................	568,000
(N)	FERNANDINA HARBOR..................................	1,371,000
(N)	FT PIERCE HARBOR...................................	255,000
(N)	IWW CALOOSAHATCHEE RIVER TO ANCLOTE RIVER............	827,000
(N)	IWW, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI.........................	2,219,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR................................	1,471,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY................................	1,927,000
(N)	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH..........................	2,092,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR.......................................	8,707,000
	GEORGIA	
(N)	AIWW (SAV. DIST.)..................................	75,000
(MP)	ALLATOONA LAKE.....................................	3,647,000
(N)	APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS..........	4,155,000
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR...................................	4,150,000
(MP)	BUFORD DAM & LAKE SIDNEY LANIER....................	4,160,000
(MP)	CARTERS LAKE.......................................	2,093,000
(MP)	CLARK HILL LAKE....................................	5,088,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE......................................	4,406,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK & DAM, GA & FL....................	2,853,000
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM & LAKE, GA & SC...............	334,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR....................................	10,423,000
(N)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA........................	348,000
(MP)	WEST POINT LAKE, GA & AL............................	3,245,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
	HAWAII	
(N)	NAWILIWILI HARBOR......................................	1,191,000
(N)	PORT ALLEN HARBOR (MAINTENANCE DREDGING)..............	500,000
	IDAHO	
(MP)	ALBENI FALLS DAM......................................	1,859,000
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM & RESERVOIR..............................	5,181,000
(FC)	LUCKY PEAK LAKE.......................................	339,000
	ILLINOIS	
(N)	CALUMET HARBOR & RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL), IL & IN......	7,500,000
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE..	3,160,000
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL)........................	1,350,000
(N)	CHICAGO HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL).......................	1,300,000
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER...	120,000
(FC)	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS.................................	107,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY.....................................	1,407,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL & IN (NCD)......................	15,732,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION............................	1,065,000
(FC)	LAKE SHELBYVILLE......................................	3,585,000
(N)	MILL CREEK & SOUTH SLOUGH.............................	35,000
(N)	MISS RIV BTWN MISSOURI RIV & MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN, WI, & IA...	5,662,000
(N)	MISS RIV BTWN MISSOURI RIV & MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN, WI, & IA (NCD).......................................	45,761,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER BTN OHIO & MISSOURI RIVERS..........	9,855,000
(FC)	MOUTH OF SANGAMON RIVER...............................	22,000
(FC)	REND LAKE...	2,480,000
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)......................	27,000
	INDIANA	
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE.......................................	370,000
(FC)	CAGLES MILL LAKE......................................	315,000
(FC)	CECIL M. HARDEN LAKE..................................	510,000
(FC)	HUNTINGTON LAKE.......................................	365,000
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL).......................	220,000
(FC)	MISSISSINEWA LAKE.....................................	340,000
(FC)	MONROE LAKE...	454,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE..	330,000
(FC)	SALAMONIE LAKE.....................................	345,000
	IOWA	
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE....................................	2,345,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA & NE.........	10,834,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIV, KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA & NE	167,000
(FC)	RATHBUN LAKE.......................................	961,000
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK........................	2,077,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE...................................	2,468,000
	KANSAS	
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE.......................................	1,069,000
(FC)	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE.................................	537,000
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE.....................................	258,000
(FC)	ELK CITY LAKE......................................	397,000
(FC)	FALL RIVER LAKE....................................	443,000
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE.....................................	461,000
(FC)	JOHN REDMOND DAM & RESERVOIR........................	578,000
(FC)	KANOPOLIS LAKE.....................................	742,000
(FC)	MARION LAKE..	969,000
(FC)	MELVERN LAKE.......................................	927,000
(FC)	MILFORD LAKE.......................................	1,120,000
(FC)	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE.....................	328,000
(FC)	PERRY LAKE...	1,241,000
(FC)	POMONA LAKE..	895,000
(FC)	TORONTO LAKE.......................................	192,000
(FC)	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE..................................	827,000
(FC)	WILSON LAKE..	1,110,000
	KENTUCKY	
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM - LAKE BARKLEY..........................	3,537,000
(FC)	BARREN RIVER LAKE..................................	870,000
(FC)	BUCKHORN LAKE......................................	630,000
(FC)	CARR FORK LAKE.....................................	705,000
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE......................................	355,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE...	685,000
(FC)	FISHTRAP LAKE......................................	1,455,000
(FC)	GRAYSON LAKE.......................................	575,000
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY & TN......................	1,555,000
(FC)	GREEN RIVER LAKE...................................	860,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
(N)	HICKMAN HARBOR	311,000
(N)	KENTUCKY RIVER	1,484,000
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE	608,000
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE	436,000
(FC)	MIDDLESBORO	39,000
(FC)	NOLIN LAKE	920,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS	10,730,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK	3,200,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE	460,000
(FC)	ROUGH RIVER LAKE	945,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE	240,000
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND	2,516,000
	LOUISIANA	
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY	7,560,000
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER MORGAN CITY TO GULF	6,700,000
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR	650,000
(FC)	BAYOU PIERRE	30,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE	500,000
(FC)	CADDO LAKE	230,000
(N)	CALCASIEU RIVER & PASS	10,970,000
(N)	FRESHWATER BAYOU	770,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	10,070,000
(N)	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL	3,000,000
(N)	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR	150,000
(N)	MADISON PARISH PORT	287,000
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER	760,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF	19,580,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE	4,800,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET	8,250,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY	1,000,000
(N)	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	1,600,000
(FC)	WALLACE LAKE	140,000
	MAINE	
(N)	KENNEBEC RIVER	482,000
	MARYLAND	
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS	6,992,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	226,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
MAINTENANCE				
BOEUF-TENSAS BASIN, AR AND LA........................	---	602,000	602,000	602,000
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR............................	---	485,000	485,000	485,000
MAPPING, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.................	---	327,000	327,000	327,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	---	6,629,000	6,629,000	6,629,000
NORTH BANK, ARKANSAS RIVER, AR.......................	---	139,000	139,000	139,000
SOUTH BANK, ARKANSAS RIVER, AR.......................	---	256,000	256,000	256,000
ST. FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO.....................	---	3,155,000	3,155,000	3,155,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA................................	---	6,994,000	7,112,000	7,112,000
BAYOU COCODRIE & TRIBUTARIES, LA.....................	---	67,000	67,000	67,000
BONNET CARRE SPILLWAY, LA............................	---	462,000	462,000	462,000
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA...............	---	700,000	700,000	700,000
OLD RIVER LA...	---	4,440,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, LA.........................	---	561,000	561,000	561,000
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS...................................	---	1,306,000	1,806,000	1,306,000
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS..............................	---	310,000	310,000	310,000
ENID LAKE, MS..	---	2,029,000	2,309,000	2,029,000
GREENWOOD, MS..	---	401,000	401,000	401,000
GRENADA LAKE, MS.....................................	---	2,815,000	2,815,000	2,815,000
YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS...........................	---	1,093,000	1,093,000	1,093,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SARDIS LAKE, MS	---	2,685,000	3,091,000	2,685,000
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS	---	1,503,000	1,503,000	1,503,000
WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS	---	210,000	210,000	210,000
YAZOO BACKWATER, MS	---	179,000	179,000	179,000
YAZOO CITY, MS	---	238,000	238,000	238,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO	---	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
REVETMENT AND DIKES	---	24,367,000	27,367,000	27,367,000
DREDGING	---	15,941,000	18,763,000	18,763,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	---	306,000	306,000	306,000
SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE		80,000,000	87,186,000	86,000,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	-15,325,000	-17,761,000	-27,861,000
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES.		282,000,000	305,090,000	285,564,000

TYPE OF STUDY OR PROJECT:
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(PHASE I) AUTHORIZED FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS).	426,000
(FC)	BLOOMINGTON LAKE, MD & WV............................	860,000
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELY, WV, MD & WV..............	59,000
(N)	HONGO RIVER AND TAR BAY..............................	791,000
(N)	NEAL SOUND...	500,000
(N)	OCEAN CITY H. & INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY.............	425,000
(N)	WICOMICO RIVER.......................................	1,310,000
	MASSACHUSETTS	
(N)	ANDREWS RIVER..	111,000
(FC)	BARRE FALLS DAM......................................	235,000
(FC)	BIRCH HILL DAM.......................................	227,000
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR..	1,632,000
(FC)	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE.....................................	208,000
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL.......................................	4,698,000
(N)	CHELSEA RIVER..	140,000
(FC)	CONANT BROOK LAKE....................................	66,000
(N)	CUTTYHUNK HARBOR.....................................	145,000
(FC)	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE..................................	187,000
(N)	FALL RIVER HARBOR, MA & RI...........................	1,438,000
(N)	GLOUCESTER HARBOR & ANNISQUAM RIVER..................	136,000
(N)	GREEN HARBOR...	273,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM...................................	195,000
(FC)	KNIGHTVILLE DAM......................................	731,000
(FC)	LITTLEVILLE LAKE.....................................	229,000
(FC)	NEW BEDFORD, FAIRHAVEN & ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER...	143,000
(FC)	TULLY LAKE...	222,000
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM..	171,000
(FC)	WESTVILLE LAKE.......................................	205,000
	MICHIGAN	
(N)	ARCADIA HARBOR.......................................	39,000
(N)	AU SABLE HARBOR......................................	32,000
(N)	BIG BAY HARBOR.......................................	18,000
(N)	CHANNELS IN STRAITS OF MACKINAC......................	210,000
(N)	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR...........................	107,000
(N)	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR....................................	139,000
(N)	CHEBOYGAN HARBOR.....................................	117,000
(N)	CLINTON RIVER..	27,000
(N)	EAGLE HARBOR...	34,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
(N)	FRANKFORT HARBOR	29,000
(N)	FRANKFORT HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	422,000
(N)	HAMMOND BAY HARBOR	28,000
(N)	HARRISVILLE HARBOR	19,000
(N)	DETROIT RIVER	8,130,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR & GRAND RIVER	510,000
(N)	GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR	143,000
(N)	GRAYS REEF PASSAGE	16,000
(N)	HARBOR BEACH HARBOR	705,000
(N)	HOLLAND HARBOR	2,913,000
(N)	INLAND ROUTE	192,000
(N)	INLAND ROUTE (DIKED DISPOSAL)	27,000
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY	396,000
(N)	LELAND HARBOR	77,000
(N)	LEXINGTON HARBOR	77,000
(N)	LITTLE LAKE HARBOR	25,000
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR	185,000
(N)	MANISTEE HARBOR	39,000
(N)	MANISTIQUE HARBOR	99,000
(N)	MENOMINEE HARBOR	38,000
(N)	MONROE HARBOR	870,000
(N)	MONROE HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	13,167,000
(N)	MUSKEGON HARBOR	292,000
(N)	NEW BUFFALO HARBOR	176,000
(N)	ONTONAGON HARBOR	162,000
(N)	PENTWATER HARBOR	67,000
(N)	POINT LOOKOUT HARBOR	196,000
(N)	PORT SANILAC HARBOR	47,000
(N)	PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR	160,000
(N)	ROUGE RIVER	735,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER	1,967,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL)	2,147,000
(N)	SAUGATUCK HARBOR	232,000
(FC)	SEBEWAING RIVER	32,000
(N)	ST JOSEPH HARBOR	809,000
(N)	ST. CLAIR RIVER	1,145,000
(MP)	ST. MARYS RIVER	9,672,000
(N)	WHITE LAKE HARBOR	93,000
	MINNESOTA	
(FC)	BIG STONE LAKE AND WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	89,000
(N)	DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	2,358,000
(N)	GRAND MARAIS HARBOR	23,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
(N)	KNIFE RIVER HARBOR	20,000
(N)	MINNESOTA RIVER	310,000
(FC)	LAC QUI PARLE LAKE	201,000
(FC)	LAKE TRAVERSE & BOIS DE SIOUX, MN & SD	190,000
(FC)	ORWELL LAKE	226,000
(FC)	RED LAKE RESERVOIR	64,000
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER	1,382,000
(N)	ST. CROIX RIVER, MN & WI	213,000
	MISSISSIPPI	
(N)	BILOXI HARBOR	52,000
(N)	CADET BAYOU	329,000
(FC)	EAST FORK TOMBIGBEE RIVER	227,000
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR	522,000
(FC)	OKATIBBEE LAKE	521,000
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR	3,189,000
(N)	PEARL RIVER	187,000
(N)	ROSEDALE HARBOR	104,000
(N)	YAZOO RIVER	48,000
	MISSOURI	
(N)	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR	320,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM & RESERVOIR	3,482,000
(FC)	CLEARWATER LAKE	1,069,000
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR	3,636,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE	436,000
(FC)	MERAMEC PARK LAKE	300,000
(N)	NEW MADRID HARBOR	11,000
(FC)	POMME DE TERRE LAKE	1,064,000
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE	562,000
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE	1,374,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE	2,765,000
	MONTANA	
(MP)	FORT PECK LAKE	4,095,000
(MP)	LIBBY DAM	2,486,000
	NEBRASKA	
(MP)	GAVINS POINT DAM - LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD	4,121,000
(FC)	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE	1,658,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES	209,000
(FC)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES	446,000
	NEVADA	
(FC)	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA	243,000
(FC)	PINE & MATHEWS CANYONS DAMS	63,000
	NEW HAMPSHIRE	
(FC)	BLACKWATER DAM	208,000
(FC)	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE	240,000
(FC)	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM	296,000
(N)	HAMPTON HARBOR	195,000
(FC)	HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES	713,000
(FC)	OTTER BROOK LAKE	291,000
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR	290,000
(FC)	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE	291,000
	NEW JERSEY	
(N)	ABSECON INLET	300,000
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET	435,000
(N)	COLD SPRING INLET	550,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO TRENTON, NJ & PA	3,076,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE	17,952,000
(N)	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK & PASSAIC RIVERS	4,200,000
(N)	NEW JERSEY IWW	1,128,000
(N)	SHOAL HARBOR & COMPTON CREEK	443,000
	NEW MEXICO	
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM	596,000
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE	1,193,000
(FC)	CONCHAS LAKE	643,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM	112,000
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM	181,000
(FC)	SANTA ROSA DAM & LAKE	446,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM	170,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
	NEW YORK	
(FC)	ALMOND LAKE	239,000
(FC)	ARKPORT DAM	207,000
(N)	BAY RIDGE & RED HOOK CHANNELS	810,000
(N)	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL & TONAWANDA HARBOR	950,000
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR	1,862,000
(N)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET	621,000
(FC)	EAST SIDNEY LAKE	227,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER	1,600,000
(FC)	MT. MORRIS LAKE	975,000
(N)	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN	25,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	3,258,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR	4,918,000
(N)	NEW YORK & NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY & NJ	5,200,000
(N)	OSWEGO HARBOR	565,000
(N)	ROCHESTER HARBOR	455,000
(FC)	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS	435,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	832,000
(FC)	WHITNEY POINT LAKE	269,000
	NORTH CAROLINA	
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	4,581,000
(N)	BEAUFORT HARBOR	279,000
(FC)	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM & LAKE	579,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON	391,000
(N)	CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT	373,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE	584,000
(N)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER	262,000
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY	1,508,000
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR	3,010,000
(N)	OCRACOKE INLET	302,000
(FC)	W. KERR SCOTT DAM & RESERVOIR	804,000
(N)	SILVER LAKE HARBOR	457,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR	2,596,000
	NORTH DAKOTA	
(FC)	BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE	188,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA	7,731,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE	97,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA & BALDHILL DAM	545,000
(FC)	PIPESTEM LAKE	321,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
	OHIO	
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE	430,000
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR	610,000
(FC)	BERLIN LAKE	1,222,000
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE	359,000
(FC)	CLARENCE J. BROWN DAM	345,000
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR	6,870,000
(N)	CONNEAUT HARBOR	830,000
(FC)	DEER CREEK LAKE	435,000
(FC)	DELAWARE LAKE	950,000
(FC)	DILLON LAKE	325,000
(N)	FAIRPORT HARBOR	1,083,000
(N)	HURON HARBOR	565,000
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR	1,585,000
(FC)	MASSILLON	15,000
(FC)	MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM & RESERVOIR	406,000
(FC)	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE	427,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER RESERVOIRS	3,270,000
(FC)	NEWARK LUCAL PROTECTION	15,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH OF KOKOSING RIVER LAKE	150,000
(FC)	PAINT CREEK LAKE	490,000
(FC)	ROSEVILLE	15,000
(N)	SANDUSKY HARBOR	775,000
(N)	TOLEDO HARBOR	3,220,000
(FC)	TOM JENKINS DAM	185,000
(FC)	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE	315,000
(FC)	WILLIAM H. HARSHA LAKE	395,000
	OKLAHOMA	
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE	474,000
(MP)	BROKEN BOW LAKE	1,161,000
(FC)	CANTON LAKE	698,000
(FC)	COPAN LAKE	393,000
(MP)	EUFAULA LAKE	2,694,000
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE	3,220,000
(FC)	FORT SUPPLY LAKE	431,000
(FC)	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE	199,000
(FC)	HEYBURN LAKE	915,000
(FC)	HUGO LAKE	707,000
(FC)	HULAH LAKE	801,000
(FC)	KAW LAKE	920,000
(MP)	KEYSTONE LAKE	1,703,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
(FC)	OOLOGAH LAKE..	1,028,000
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE...	514,000
(FC)	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES...........	8,000
(FC)	PINE CREEK LAKE.......................................	412,000
(MP)	ROBERT S. KERR LOCK, DAM & RESERVOIR..................	2,290,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE...	453,000
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE...	197,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE..................................	2,638,000
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE..	763,000
(MP)	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK & DAM..............................	2,108,000
(FC)	WISTER LAKE...	617,000
	OREGON	
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE..	458,000
(FC)	BLUE RIVER LAKE.......................................	205,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE LOCK & DAM.................................	8,944,000
(N)	C & LW RIVERS BELOW VANCOUVER AND PORTLAND, OR & WA...	18,045,000
(N)	CHETCO RIVER..	372,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA..................	4,973,000
(N)	COOS BAY..	2,413,000
(N)	COOS AND MILLICOMA RIVERS.............................	158,000
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER..	356,000
(FC)	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE....................................	585,000
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE...	785,000
(MP)	DETROIT LAKE..	1,557,000
(FC)	DORENA LAKE...	273,000
(FC)	FALL CREEK LAKE.......................................	325,000
(FC)	FERN RIDGE DAM & LAKE.................................	617,000
(MP)	GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES..............................	1,560,000
(MP)	HILLS CREEK LAKE......................................	525,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, LAKE UMATILLA, OR & WA.........	9,491,000
(MP)	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE....................................	2,095,000
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE.......................................	2,419,000
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK & DAM, LAKE WALLULA, OR & WA..............	11,245,000
(N)	ROGUE RIVER HARBOR AT GOLD BEACH......................	895,000
(N)	PORT ORFORD...	86,000
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER...	879,000
(N)	SKIPANON CHANNEL......................................	292,000
(N)	TILLAMOOK BAY & BAR...................................	415,000
(N)	UMPQUA RIVER..	1,188,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BANK PROTECTION......................	200,000
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER & WILLAMETTE FALLS...................	465,000
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER ABOVE PORTLAND & YAMHILL RIVER.......	46,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
(N)	YAQUINA RIVER	91,000
(N)	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR	636,000
	PENNSYLVANIA	
(N)	ALLEGHENY RIVER	4,045,000
(FC)	ALVIN R. BUSH DAM	342,000
(FC)	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE	123,000
(FC)	BELTZVILLE LAKE	402,000
(FC)	BLUE MARSH LAKE	1,024,000
(FC)	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE	535,000
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE	852,000
(FC)	CROOKED CREEK LAKE	800,000
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE	495,000
(FC)	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE	692,000
(N)	ERIE HARBOR	310,000
(FC)	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM & RESERVOIR	398,000
(FC)	FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM	338,000
(FC)	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM & RESERVOIR	100,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN	372,000
(FC)	KINZUA DAM & ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA & NY	1,064,000
(FC)	LOYALHANNA LAKE	564,000
(FC)	MAHONING CREEK LAKE	330,000
(N)	MONONGAHELA-YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN, PA, WV, & MD	6,268,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS	8,406,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK	440,000
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE	236,000
(FC)	PUNXSUTAWNEY	5,000
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE	2,241,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER	1,222,000
(FC)	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE	1,458,000
(FC)	STILLWATER LAKE	194,000
(FC)	TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES	1,546,000
(FC)	TIONESTA LAKE	765,000
(FC)	UNION CITY LAKE	303,000
(FC)	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE	453,000
(FC)	YORK, INDIAN ROCK DAM	349,000
(FC)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE	968,000
	RHODE ISLAND	
(N)	BLOCK ISLAND HARBOR OF REFUGE	162,000
(N)	GREAT SALT POND	256,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
	SOUTH CAROLINA	
(N)	AIWW, (CHAS. DIST.)	3,620,000
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR	6,323,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER	295,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR	3,787,000
(N)	FOLLY RIVER	252,000
(N)	LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	1,085,000
(N)	SHIPYARD RIVER	513,000
	SOUTH DAKOTA	
(MP)	BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE	3,472,000
(FC)	COLD BROOK LAKE	97,000
(FC)	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE	76,000
(MP)	FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE	6,860,000
(MP)	OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	5,739,000
	TENNESSEE	
(MP)	CENTER HILL LAKE	2,827,000
(MP)	CHEATHAM LOCK & DAM	2,910,000
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM & RESERVOIR	2,517,000
(MP)	DALE HOLLOW LAKE	2,410,000
(MP)	J. PERCY PRIEST DAM & RESERVOIR	1,862,000
(MP)	OLD HICKORY LOCK & DAM	3,421,000
(N)	TENNESSEE RIVER	6,204,000
(N)	WOLF RIVER	475,000
	TEXAS	
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE	412,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL (AREA 8)	64,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS-RED RIV BASINS CHLOR. CONTROL (DATA STATIONS)	88,000
(FC)	BARDWELL LAKE	647,000
(FC)	BELTON LAKE	1,287,000
(FC)	BENBROOK LAKE	801,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR	3,497,000
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	1,348,000
(FC)	CANYON LAKE	907,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT)	7,185,000
(MP)	DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX & OK	4,717,000
(FC)	ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT	15,000
(FC)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O' THE PINES	2,814,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR	1,620,000
(FC)	GRANGER LAKE	648,000
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE	1,189,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOSTAL WATERWAY (TEXAS SEGMENT)	12,060,000
(FC)	HORDS CREEK LAKE	747,000
(N)	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL	11,710,000
(FC)	LAKE KEMP	162,000
(FC)	LAVON LAKE	1,357,000
(FC)	LEWISVILLE DAM	1,943,000
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL	5,450,000
(FC)	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE	602,000
(FC)	NORTH SAN GABRIEL LAKE	750,000
(FC)	O. C. FISHER DAM & LAKE	559,000
(FC)	PAT MAYSE LAKE	345,000
(FC)	PROCTOR LAKE	885,000
(N)	SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY	9,152,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM & RESERVOIR	1,892,000
(FC)	SOMERVILLE LAKE	1,125,000
(FC)	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM	861,000
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF DAM & B.A. STEINHAGEN LAKE	613,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE	1,269,000
(FC)	WALLISVILLE PROJECT - TRINITY RIVER	65,000
(MP)	WHITNEY LAKE	1,300,000
(FC)	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM & LAKE	1,461,000
	VERMONT	
(FC)	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE	410,000
(FC)	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE	263,000
(FC)	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE	283,000
(FC)	TOWNSHEND LAKE	260,000
(FC)	UNION VILLAGE DAM	239,000
	VIRGINIA	
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (NORFOLK DISTRICT)	1,785,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE BAY	282,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET	510,000
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW	833,000
(N)	HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEW HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	204,000
(N)	JAMES RIVER	2,688,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
(MP)	JOHN H. KERR DAM & RESERVOIR, VA & NC	3,702,000
(FC)	JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM & RESERVOIR	630,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR	5,248,000
(FC)	NORTH FORK OF POUND LAKE	235,000
(MP)	PHILPOTT LAKE	1,224,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	282,000
(N)	WATERWAY ON COAST OF VIRGINIA	1,137,000
	WASHINGTON	
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM	4,876,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY	206,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK & HEAD OF SAND ISLAND	297,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA & THE DALLES	503,000
(N)	EDIZ HOOK	40,000
(N)	EVERETT HARBOR & SNOHOMISH RIVER	80,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER	3,575,000
(FC)	HOWARD A. HANSON RESERVOIR	530,000
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK & DAM	4,345,000
(N)	LAKE RIVER	36,000
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL	2,709,000
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK & DAM, LAKE BRYAN	4,401,000
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA & ID	4,703,000
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK & DAM	3,747,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE	256,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM	968,000
(N)	PUGET SOUND & ITS TRIBUTARY WATERS	600,000
(N)	QUILLAYUTE RIVER	65,000
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR	65,000
(N)	SKAMOKOWA CREEK	41,000
(FC)	STILLAGUMISH RIVER	50,000
(N)	SWINOMISH CHANNEL	70,000
(FC)	TACOMA - PUYALLUP RIVER	40,000
(MP)	THE DALLES LOCK & DAM, WA & OR	7,369,000
(N)	WILLAPA RIVER & HARBOR & NASELLE RIVER	60,000
(FC)	WYNOOCHEE LAKE	881,000
	WEST VIRGINIA	
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE	485,000
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE	615,000
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE	590,000
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE	755,000
(FC)	ELKINS	4,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER	6,083,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK	4,565,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS	9,336,000
(FC)	R. D. BAILEY LAKE	655,000
(FC)	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE	1,010,000
(FC)	SUTTON LAKE	860,000
(N)	TYGART LAKE	527,000
	WISCONSIN	
(N)	ASHLAND HARBOR	25,000
(FC)	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE	286,000
(N)	FOX RIVER	2,230,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR	1,210,000
(N)	KEWAUNEE HARBOR	1,051,000
(FC)	LAFARGE LAKE	22,000
(N)	MANITOWAC HARBOR	133,000
(N)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR	677,000
(N)	OCONTO HARBOR	18,000
(N)	PORT WING HARBOR	19,000
(N)	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR	58,000
(N)	SHEBOYGAN RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL)	174,000
(N)	STURGEON BAY	53,000
	AMERICAN SAMOA	
(N)	OFU SMALL BOAT HARBOR	550,000
	MISCELLANEOUS	
	ENVIRONMENTAL AND WATER QUALITY OPERATIONAL STUDIES	5,000,000
	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	5,910,000
	SCHEDULING FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIR OPERATIONS	1,738,000
	MONITOR COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	900,000
	RIVER ICE MANAGEMENT	295,000
	PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION	
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS AND OBSTRUCTIONS	1,850,000
	PROTECTION, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	116,000
	GENERAL REGULATORY FUNCTIONS	46,966,000
	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS	5,592,000
	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS	1,539,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Allowance (3)
	MOBILIZATION PLANNING	5,000,000
	ADVANCE PREPARATION	---
		===============
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGES	-19,178,000
		===============
	TOTAL	1,137,928,000
		===============

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1982	$40,000,000
Budget estimate, 1983	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	7,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+7,000,000
House allowance	+7,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,000,000 for flood control and coastal emergencies.

The funds recommended provide for advance preparation measures associated with flood emergencies, flood fighting and rescue operations, and other emergency work.

An amount of $7,000,000 was proposed in the President's budget request for 1983 under the "Operation and maintenance, general" account for advance preparation work related to Public Law 84-99 emergency requirements. The Committee believes that this funding should be provided under the normal flood control and coastal emergencies account.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations 1982	$96,000,000
Budget estimate, 1983	99,000,000
House allowance	99,000,000
Committee recommendation	99,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $99,000,000, the same as the House allowance and budget request.

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the division offices, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

SPECIAL RECREATION USE FEES

Appropriations, 1982	$4,784,000
Budget estimate, 1983	6,000,000
House allowance	6,000,000
Committee recommendation	6,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $6,000,000.

The Special Recreation Use Fee revenues authorized under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Amendment Act of 1972 will be used for authorized recreation purposes at over 160 Corps of Engineers water resource projects which include fee collecting, recreation facility development, and items essential to the health and safety of the using public.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1982	$30,596,000
Budget estimate, 1983	36,485,000
House allowance	37,435,000
Committee recommendation	33,362,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−3,123,000
House allowance	−4,073,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $33,362,000, which is $3,123,000 below the budget request and $4,073,000 below the House allowance.

The Committee is concerned that the Bureau of Reclamation is not placing proper emphasis on those ongoing studies and investigations approved by the Congress. For example, in 1 of the 17 reclamation States in the West 7 of the 9 continuing studies funded in 1982 have been delayed by 1 year or longer. Even though sizable reductions were required in fiscal 1982 those reductions were still about half of that proposed in the amended budget request.

In light of this and the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation is moving to get those studies back on schedule, the Committee feels it inappropriate to initiate all of the 13 new studies proposed in the 1983 budget and has made adjustments in this regard. The Committee realizes that unanticipated problems will arise, but expects Reclamation to move aggressively to carryout the schedules anticipated by the appropriation recommended for each study and to bring to final conclusion those studies which are not economically feasible.

SOUTH DAKOTA WATER STUDIES

The Committee is aware of the cooperation and progress that the Bureau of Reclamation and local interests, including the State of South Dakota, have made relative to the CENDAK study. Given the past history, the Committee feels that additional funding to complete the survey efforts is justified and has added $400,000 to expedite the completion schedule.

The Committee has also recommended $500,000 for the South Dakota water deliveries study, an increase of $450,000. The additional funds will be used to accelerate the plan of study in 1983.

Given the importance of the two investigations mentioned above, the Committee feels that the Bureau of Reclamation effort should be focused on these ongoing activities and has recommended adjustments in the two new studies included in the budget.

ATMOSPHERIC WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The Committee has deleted, without prejudice, $865,000 for initial field studies and equipment procurement for the Colorado River augmentation program. Given the current estimate of over $68,000,000 for a 5-year demonstration effort, the Committee feels that specific authority should be provided by the legislative committees and that a comprehensive program plan be available before a demonstration program of this magnitude is initiated.

The Committee recommendation includes an additional $650,000 to continue HIPLEX related research and aircraft operations in 1983.

LA VERKIN SPRINGS STUDY, UTAH

Within funds available, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to use up to $200,000 to analyze the physical and economic viability of combining features of the proposed Quail Creek project and the La Verkin Springs desalinization project in Utah. The Bureau is urged to coordinate the study effort with State and local interests.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and activities are shown in the following table:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ARIZONA				
LOWER COLORADO RIVER WATER CONSV. & EFFICIENT USE PROG	SP.INV.	740,000	740,000	740,000
SOLAR-HYDRO INTEGRATION	FEAS.-P	155,000	155,000	---
CALIFORNIA				
CENTRAL VALLEY:				
SHASTA DIVISION, ENLARGED SHASTA LAKE INVESTIGATION	FEAS.-P	1,070,000	1,070,000	1,070,000
DELTA SUPPORT STUDIES	SP.INV.	350,000	550,000	350,000
DELTA DIVISION, KELLOGG UNIT REFORMULATION	FEAS.	175,000	175,000	175,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT STUDY	SP.INV.	400,000	400,000	400,000
SAN JOAQUIN DRAINAGE INVESTIGATIONS	FEAS.	450,000	450,000	450,000
CENTRAL CALIFORNIA-NEVADA WIND ENERGY STUDY	SP.INV.	150,000	150,000	150,000
GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES INVESTIGATIONS	SP.INV.	30,000	30,000	30,000
SANTA MARGARITA	FEAS.-M&I	122,000	300,000	122,000
WATER CONSERV. OPPORTUNITIES, IMPERIAL IRRIG. DISTRICT	SP.INV.	85,000	85,000	85,000
LOWER COLORADO WATER SUPPLY STUDY	FEAS.	100,000	100,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
COLORADO				
COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON POWERPLANTS....................	FEAS,-P	50,000	50,000	50,000
DOMINGUEZ RESERVOIR PROJECT..........................	FEAS.-P,M&I	---	400,000	---
WATER RESOURCES PLANNING & ENGINEERING RESEARCH.......		5,209,000	5,209,000	5,209,000
IDAHO				
BOISE PROJECT POWER AND MODIFICATION STUDY............	FEAS.-P	470,000	470,000	470,000
BOISE PROJECT, ANDERSON RANCH POWERPLANT, THIRD UNIT..	ADV.PLNG.-P	300,000	300,000	300,000
IDAHO ANAD. FISH HABITAT RESTORATION..................	APPR.	100,000	100,000	100,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT,NORTH SIDE PUMPING DIVISION EXTEN....	FEAS.	75,000	75,000	75,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, MINIDOKA POWERPLANT REHABILITATION AND ENLARGEMENT....................................	ADV.PLNG.-P	350,000	350,000	350,000
PALISADES PROJECT, PALISADES POWERPLANT ENLARGMENT....	ADV.PLNG.-P	350,000	350,000	350,000
KANSAS				
SOLOMON RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY (P-SMBP)...	SP.INV.	330,000	330,000	330,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
MONTANA				
HUNGRY HORSE POWERPLANT ENLARGE & REREGULATING RESV	FEAS.-P	225,000	225,000	225,000
OFFSTREAM STORAGE, YELLOWSTONE RIVER	APPR.-M&I	106,000	106,000	106,000
TIBER POWERPLANT (P-SMBP)	FEAS.-P	106,000	106,000	106,000
YELLOWTAIL PROJECT, YELLOWTAIL AFTERBAY POWERPLANT (P-SMBP)	ADV.PLNG.-P	300,000	300,000	300,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT, BUFFALO BILL POWERPLANT	ADV.PLNG.-P	250,000	250,000	250,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT, BUFFALO BILL DAM MODIFICATIONS	ADV.PLNG.-P	150,000	150,000	150,000
NEBRASKA				
PRAIRIE BEND UNIT (P-SMBP)	FEAS.	150,000	150,000	150,000
REPUBLICAN RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY (P-SMBP)	SP.INV.	267,000	267,000	267,000
NEVADA				
DEEP-CARBONATE AQUIFER INVESTIGATION	SP.INV.	100,000	100,000	100,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
NEW MEXICO				
LAKE MEREDITH SALINITY CONTROL	FEAS.	240,000	240,000	240,000
SANTA CRUZ DAM AND RESERVOIR STUDY	FEAS.-I	95,000	95,000	95,000
TULAROSA BASIN WATER AND ENERGY STUDY	APPR.-M&I	180,000	180,000	180,000
NORTH DAKOTA				
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, M&I WATER FACILITIES (GARRISON DIVISION, P-SMBP)	FEAS.-M&I	106,000	106,000	106,000
OREGON				
ROGUE RIVER BASIN, GRANTS PASS DIVISION	FEAS.-I	100,000	100,000	100,000
ROGUE RIVER BASIN, MEDFORD DIVISION (REFORMULATION)	FEAS.-M&I	5,000	5,000	5,000
UMATILLA BASIN	FEAS.-I,M&I	125,000	125,000	125,000
UPPER JOHN DAY	FEAS.-I	135,000	135,000	135,000
UPPER KLAMATH OFFSTREAM STORAGE STUDY	APPR.-P	100,000	100,000	100,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SOUTH DAKOTA				
CENTRAL SOUTH DAKOTA WATER STUDIES (P-SMBP)...........	APPR.-I,M&I	100,000	100,000	500,000
CROW CREEK INDIAN RESERVATION AREA....................	APPR.-I	200,000	200,000	50,000
RAPID CITY WATER SUPPLY...............................	APPR.-M&I	200,000	200,000	50,000
SOUTH DAKOTA WATER DELIVERIES STUDY (P-SMBP)..........	APPR.-I,M&I	50,000	50,000	500,000
TEXAS				
NUECES RIVER BASIN STUDY..............................	SP.INV.	220,000	220,000	220,000
TEXAS BASIN, BON WIER.................................	FEAS.	230,000	230,000	230,000
TEXAS BASIN, COLUMBUS BEND M&I WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	FEAS.-M&I	225,000	225,000	---
UTAH				
CRSP POWER PEAKING CAPACITY...........................	FEAS.-P	1,185,000	1,185,000	1,185,000
WASATCH FRONT TOTAL WATER MANAGEMENT..................	SP.INV.	70,000	70,000	70,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
WASHINGTON				
YAKIMA, CLE ELUM AND TIETON POWERPLANTS..............	FEAS.-P	310,000	310,000	310,000
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT.................	FEAS.-I	805,000	805,000	805,000
WYOMING				
GUERNSEY DAM POWERPLANT ENLARGEMENT..................	FEAS.-P	100,000	100,000	100,000
NORTH PLATTE RIVER HYDROELECTRIC STUDY (P-SMBP).......	FEAS.-P	320,000	320,000	320,000
SHOSHONE VALLEY M AND I WATER SUPPLY.................	APPR.-M&I	200,000	200,000	---
WIND HYDROELECTRIC ENERGY PROJECT....................	FEAS.-P	1,943,000	1,943,000	1,943,000
VARIOUS				
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM......	FEAS.	5,778,000	5,778,000	5,778,000
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM......	ADV.PLNG.	300,000	300,000	---
HYDRO POWER AT EXISTING RESERVOIRS...................	SP.INV.-P	370,000	370,000	370,000
GENERAL ENGINEERING AND RESEARCH:				
ATMOSPHERIC WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM......		4,323,000	4,873,000	4,108,000
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES............................		500,000	500,000	500,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1982	$548,505,000
Budget estimate, 1983	666,585,000
House allowance	670,491,000
Committee recommendation	638,785,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	–27,800,000
House allowance	–31,706,000

A new appropriation of $638,785,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is $31,706,000 below the House allowance and $27,800,000 below the budget request for fiscal year 1983.

NEWLANDS PROJECT, NEVADA

The Committee is aware of the need to demonstrate the effectiveness of various water management measures related to the Newlands project in Nevada. Studies for the proposed Newland project rehabilitation and betterment program show that appreciable amounts of water could be saved if such measures as canal lining and automatic system operation were provided. Therefore, an amount of $600,000 is recommended by the Committee to line a 1.5 mile test section of canal to verify the reduction in water losses.

IMPACTS OF GROUND-WATER DEVELOPMENT ON RECLAMATION PROJECTS IN NEBRASKA AND KANSAS

The Committee has learned that severe water supply problems are being experienced by five Bureau of Reclamation projects, one in Nebraska and four in Kansas. These projects are affected as a result of the development and use of upstream ground-water aquifiers for irrigation and various land and water conservation practices.

The fact that the States of Nebraska and Kansas are not aggressively addressing the problem of developing ground-water irrigation in conjunction with surface water irrigation projects is a matter of deep concern. These Reclamation projects have thus far been adversely impacted to the extent that the ability of the water users to repay their contractual obligations has been severely curtailed.

Unless the States recognize the need to administer the ground-water development in conjunction with surface water irrigation projects, the repayment of the existing Reclamation projects' contractual obligations and the development of new projects are jeopardized.

GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, N. DAK.

The Committee has included $4,000,000, the administration's budget request, for the Garrison Diversion project, N. Dak. The Committee also supports and expects implementation of the commitment made by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation to increase the Garrison construction budget to $14,000,000 in fiscal year 1983 as indicated in their testimony before the Energy and Water Subcommittee earlier this year.

WEB PIPELINE, S. DAK.

The Committee recommendation is that $3,000,000 is to be available for the WEB rural water development project in South Dakota in accordance with the project authorization. The Committee is aware of the importance of this project to the State of South Dakota and urges the Secretary of the Interior to expedite the provisions of the project authorization.

The amount recommended by the Committee is shown on the following table along with the budget request and House allowance:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS:				
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORD. ACTIVITIES.....	SP.INV.	2,783,000	2,783,000	2,583,000
INVESTIGATIONS OF EXISTING PROJECTS.................	SP.INV.	1,183,000	1,183,000	883,000
MINOR WORK IN CONNECTION WITH COMPLETED PROJ.INVEST.	SP.INV.	883,000	883,000	883,000
PRINT REPORTS.......................................	SP.INV.	35,000	35,000	35,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES......................	SP.INV.	1,017,000	1,167,000	917,000
PROJECTS NOT YET IDENTIFIED.........................	SP.INV.	35,000	35,000	35,000
SUBTOTAL, VARIOUS................................		17,207,000	17,907,000	16,092,000
GENERAL REDUCTION DUE TO SLIPPAGE, SAVINGS, AND CARRYOVER BALANCES............................		-681,000	-1,209,000	-2,559,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS..................		36,485,000	37,435,000	33,362,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION					
CALIFORNIA					
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:					
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION	323,663,000	271,748,000	11,856,000	11,856,000	11,856,000
SAN LUIS UNIT	1,140,348,000	468,961,000	1,166,000	1,322,000	1,166,000
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT:					
AUBURN AREA FACILITIES	1,606,952,000	222,931,000	1,597,000	1,597,000	1,597,000
ALL OTHER AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT FACILITIES	361,482,000	104,049,000	3,403,000	3,403,000	3,403,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS:					
TRINITY RIVER DIVISION, GRASS VALLEY CREEK DEBRIS DAM (PRECONSTRUCTION PLANNING)	750,000	---	---	450,000	---
ALL OTHER MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS	853,632,000	844,362,000	3,770,000	3,770,000	3,770,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION	338,834,000	105,394,000	38,178,000	38,178,000	38,178,000
COLORADO					
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT	480,750,000	446,792,000	12,707,000	12,707,000	12,707,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION	74,869,000	8,066,000	4,798,000	4,798,000	4,798,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
NEVADA					
NEWLANDS PROJECT	700,000	---	---	---	600,000
SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER PROJECT	173,034,000	169,202,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
NEW MEXICO					
BRANTLEY PROJECT	243,046,000	10,086,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
OKLAHOMA					
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT	170,133,000	30,115,000	53,077,000	53,077,000	53,077,000
TEXAS					
NUECES RIVER PROJECT	85,988,000	72,945,000	5,091,000	5,091,000	5,091,000
WASHINGTON					
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, OROVILLE-TONASKET UNIT	71,900,000	18,023,000	16,700,000	16,700,000	16,700,000
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT:					
IRRIGATION FACILITIES	3,185,532,000	863,211,000	18,779,000	18,779,000	18,779,000
THIRD POWERPLANT	667,000,000	579,545,000	31,600,000	31,600,000	31,600,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
VARIOUS					
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO..............	29,038,000	25,997,000	620,000	620,000	620,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, WHITESTONE COULEE UNIT, WA	8,851,000	7,651,000	765,000	765,000	765,000
GILA PROJECT, WELLTON-MOHAWK I.D., ARIZONA..........	77,820,000	73,814,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON-CALIFORNIA..................	39,033,000	32,292,000	1,989,000	1,989,000	1,989,000
LITTLE WOOD RIVER PROJECT, IDAHO....................	2,495,000	2,281,000	115,000	115,000	115,000
MISCELLANEOUS ENGINEERING SERVICES..................	416,000	365,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OKLAHOMA.....................	41,366,000	41,266,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT, TEXAS........................	71,219,000	70,905,000	309,000	309,000	309,000
RECREATION FACILITIES AT EXISTING RESERVOIRS,VAR....	2,808,000	1,624,000	16,000	16,000	16,000
SAN ANGELO PROJECT, TWIN BUTTES DAM, TEXAS..........	33,231,000	31,157,000	2,074,000	2,074,000	2,074,000
TUALATIN PROJECT, OREGON............................	60,059,000	54,544,000	510,000	510,000	510,000
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT, FOSS DAM, OKLAHOMA...........	40,521,000	31,463,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
WASHOE PROJECT, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA...................	259,137,000	34,724,000	3,542,000	3,542,000	3,542,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH...........................	97,954,000	94,354,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION.........			14,350,000	14,350,000	14,350,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:					
BOISE PROJECT, BLACK CANYON DAM, IDAHO..............	5,427,000	279,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
HYRUM PROJECT, HYRUM DAM, UTAH......................	9,488,000	1,458,000	4,888,000	4,888,000	4,888,000
GUERNSEY DAM, NORTH PLATTE PROJECT, WYOMING & NEBR..	2,340,000	---	---	2,300,000	2,300,000
MILK RIVER PROJECT, LAKE SHERBURNE DAM, MONTANA.....	4,455,000	3,055,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, ISLAND PARK DAM, IDAHO............	5,710,000	2,435,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, JACKSON LAKE DAM, WYOMING.........	6,805,000	2,904,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, LAHONTAN DAM, NEVADA..............	6,700,000	1,352,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
ORLAND PROJECT, EAST PARK DAM, CALIFORNIA...........	6,904,000	149,000	220,000	---	220,000
ORLAND PROJECT, STONY GORGE DAM, CALIFORNIA.........	4,846,000	803,000	500,000	720,000	500,000
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM, SOUTH DAKOTA...	8,500,000	2,024,000	4,420,000	4,420,000	4,420,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, ARIZONA.......	8,860,000	325,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
SUN RIVER PROJECT, WILLOW CREEK DAM, MONTANA........	5,600,000	1,542,000	1,940,000	1,940,000	1,940,000
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.......................	4,200,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
MODIFICATION REPORTS AND PRECONSTRUCTION PLANNING...	52,741,000	6,507,000	5,910,000	5,910,000	5,910,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS........................			25,828,000	28,128,000	28,128,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:					
CARLSBAD PROJECT, NEW MEXICO........................	5,987,000	5,326,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
GRAND VALLEY PROJECT, ORCHARD MESA DIVISION, COLO..	2,816,000	318,000	2,150,000	2,150,000	2,150,000
HUNTLEY PROJECT, MONTANA............................	7,800,000	967,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
OKANOGAN PROJECT, OKANOGAN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA..	11,669,000	---	500,000	500,000	500,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1982	$118,518,000
Budget estimate, 1983	140,850,000
House allowance	142,306,000
Committee recommendation	136,850,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−4,000,000
House allowance	−5,456,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $136,850,000, which is $5,456,000 below the House allowance and $4,000,000 below the budget request.

In 1982, a total of 30 project areas, or divisions of projects will be operated and maintained for power, municipal and industrial water supplies, irrigation, and other benefits with funds made available under this appropriation.

The Committee recommends a general reduction of $4,000,000 to lower the rate of increase and to bring the program into line with current projections.

The Committee does not believe that the operation and maintenance program is the appropriate place for the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake the Colorado River augmentation demonstration and research program. Therefore, none of the funds available for the operation and maintenance program shall be used to undertake any operational activities, field studies, or equipment procurement unless specifically authorized by law and approved by the Committees on Appropriations.

Within the funds provided, the Bureau of Reclamation is directed to reconstruct the farm access road that runs along the east side of the Tehama-Colusa Canal fish facilities to reasonable and usable standards as defined in the land purchase contract.

Blacktail Road, Minidoka project, Ohio.—The Committee believes the Bureau of Reclamation should honor commitments made to citizens and elected officials in Bonneville County, Idaho, to improve a three-quarter mile section of road providing access to the Ririe Reservoir, as authorized. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Bureau to use available funds to accomplish needed improvements on the Blacktail Road.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1982	$22,614,000
Budget estimate, 1983	39,600,000
House allowance	46,275,000
Committee recommendation	31,600,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−8,000,000
House allowance	−14,675,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $31,600,000. This is $14,675,000 below the House allowance and $8,000,000 below the budget request.

This appropriation provides for loans to non-Federal organizations for construction and rehabilitation of distribution systems and for loans and grants to construct small irrigation projects.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
P-SMBP, FRENCHMAN-CAMBRIDGE DIVISION, NEBRASKA......	4,400,000	3,870,000	529,000	529,000	529,000
P-SMBP, HELENA VALLEY UNIT, MONTANA.................	2,000,000	---	400,000	400,000	400,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT, FRANNIE DIVISION, WYOMING.........	1,600,000	200,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT, HEART MOUNTAIN DIVISION, WYOMING..	5,500,000	600,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT, WILLWOOD DIVISION, WYOMING........	1,600,000	883,000	335,000	335,000	335,000
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT, UTAH.....................	300,000	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
SUN RIVER PROJECT, GREENFIELDS DIVISION, MONTANA....	8,300,000	5,437,000	1,440,000	1,440,000	1,440,000
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT, COLORADO.......................	5,640,000	1,136,000	1,128,000	1,128,000	1,128,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, GRANDVIEW IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA...	2,930,000	10,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, GRANGER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA.....	1,330,000	---	50,000	50,000	50,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, OUTLOOK IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA.....	2,517,000	10,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, SUNNYSIDE BOARD OF CONTROL, WA......	15,883,000	10,000	145,000	145,000	145,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, SUNNYSIDE VALLEY IRRIGATION DIST, WA	13,221,000	50,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, YAKIMA-TIETON IRRIG. DIST., WA......	62,333,000	1,100,000	16,850,000	16,850,000	16,850,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT OF EXISTING PROJECTS.............................			26,632,000	26,632,000	26,632,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM					
COLORADO					
NARROWS UNIT (PRECONSTRUCTION PLANNING)...............	362,235,000	5,858,000	500,000	500,000	500,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
NEBRASKA					
NORTH LOUP DIVISION....................................	252,080,000	46,429,000	38,854,000	38,854,000	38,854,000
O'NEILL UNIT..	364,560,000	6,714,000	700,000	---	---
NORTH DAKOTA					
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT.............................	1,097,592,000	159,961,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
SOUTH DAKOTA					
OAHE UNIT...	490,000,000	41,453,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
WEB PIPELINE..	70,000,000	1,900,000	---	---	3,000,000
WYOMING					
RIVERTON UNIT.......................................	41,528,000	30,463,000	6,450,000	6,450,000	6,450,000
VARIOUS					
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
EAST BENCH UNIT, MONTANA............................	24,230,000	22,885,000	79,000	79,000	79,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA	42,836,000	39,327,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING	6,930,000	6,565,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION			1,219,000	1,219,000	1,219,000
SUBTOTAL, PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM			51,823,000	51,123,000	54,123,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION			327,355,000	329,561,000	332,555,000
UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT					
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND					
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS					
COLORADO					
DALLAS CREEK PROJECT	110,432,000	40,492,000	38,829,000	38,829,000	38,829,000
DOLORES PROJECT	359,322,000	100,227,000	45,714,000	45,714,000	45,714,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
UTAH					
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT..................	1,642,491,000	355,010,000	79,623,000	79,623,000	79,623,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, JENSEN UNIT......................	76,484,000	52,184,000	6,249,000	6,249,000	6,249,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT (PRECONSTRUCTION PLANNING)..	156,953,000	4,650,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UPALCO UNIT......................	90,424,000	6,581,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
VARIOUS					
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND:					
MODIFICATIONS & ADDITIONS TO COMPLETED FACILITIES.	16,128,000	10,452,000	3,595,000	3,595,000	3,595,000
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS:					
SAN JUAN-CHAMA PROJECT, COLORADO-NEW MEXICO.......	109,363,000	73,707,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION.........			3,795,000	3,795,000	3,795,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES:					
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES	171,018,000	63,672,000	11,058,000	11,058,000	11,058,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES	146,489,000	47,327,000	2,610,000	2,610,000	2,610,000
SUBTOTAL, RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES			13,668,000	13,668,000	13,668,000
TOTAL, UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT			189,378,000	189,378,000	189,378,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT					
ARIZONA					
CENTRAL ARIZONA-WATER DEVELOPMENT	2,437,745,000	932,359,000	160,490,000	160,490,000	160,490,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA, NON-INDIAN DISTR. SYSTEMS	552,000,000	2,000,000	500,000	10,500,000	500,000
TOTAL, CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT			160,990,000	170,990,000	160,990,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS					
TITLE II					
COLORADO					
GRAND VALLEY UNIT	236,969,000	27,862,000	8,902,000	8,902,000	8,902,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT	84,037,000	9,430,000	6,401,000	6,401,000	6,401,000
NEVADA					
LAS VEGAS WASH UNIT	104,365,000	3,349,000	973,000	973,000	973,000
VARIOUS					
TITLE I MEASURES BELOW IMPERIAL DAM	471,624,000	193,189,000	44,329,000	44,329,000	44,329,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS			60,605,000	60,605,000	60,605,000
GENERAL REDUCTION DUE TO SLIPPAGE, SAVINGS AND CARRYOVER BALANCES	---	---	-71,743,000	-80,043,000	-104,743,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			666,585,000	670,491,000	638,785,000

The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 was enacted for the purpose of encouraging local participation by qualified organizations in the development of small reclamation projects and to provide Federal assistance in the development of similar projects by non-Federal organizations.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1982	$39,928,000
Budget estimate, 1983	49,300,000
House allowance	49,300,000
Committee recommendation	45,300,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−4,000,000
House allowance	−4,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $45,300,000, which is $4,000,000 below the House allowance and budget request.

This appropriation finances the general administrative and technical direction of the reclamation program as performed by the Department, Denver regional and other offices in the seven regions.

A general reduction of $4,000,000 is recommended to bring the increase in this item in line with current administration projections.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

In the past, the general administrative expenses program was readily identified as comprising those employees responsible for overall management and direction of Reclamation activities. Projection of annual administrative costs was sufficiently accurate to allow the maintenance of a 1-year account to finance the program.

However, the decision to include major acquisitions of equipment, particularly the replacement of the central computer facility, in the general administrative expenses account could cause inefficient use of appropriated funds. Millions of dollars identified for major acquisitions will lapse at the end of the fiscal year if, for some reason, contracts for the purchase of equipment have not been executed in time to obligate available funds. If the administrative expense appropriation were redesignated as a no-year account, this problem would be averted, along with the potential for waste of taxpayer funds and increased Federal spending.

The Committee understands that the Bureau does not anticipate any difficulty in awarding contracts for major acquisitions; however, this preventive measure would assure that the procurement process is not in any way compromised by the continued existence of a deadline for obligation of funds, and feels it warrants serious consideration during the fiscal 1984 budget review.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1982	$2,900,000
Budget estimate, 1983	
House allowance	2,700,000
Committee recommendation	2,700,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+2,700,000
House allowance	

An appropriation of $2,700,000 is recommended for salaries and expenses of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The salaries and expenses appropriation finances the full cost of the Federal cochairman and his immediate staff and 50 percent of the administrative expenses of the Commission. The recommendation provides for the same personnel level as in 1982 necessary to administer ARC programs at a reduced level, and reflects reduced operating levels consistent with the phase-down program.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1982	$150,000,000
Budget estimate, 1983	[1] 80,000,000
House allowance	145,000,000
Committee recommendation	145,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+65,000,000
House allowance	

[1] Included under Department of Transportation, "Federal Highway Administration" budget request.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $145,000,000 for the Appalachian Regional Development programs. The recommended program level provides $95,000,000 for the highway program; $5,000,000 for local development districts and technical assistance; and $49,200,000 for area development programs.

The Committee is aware that the President again has not included funding in his fiscal year 1983 budget for programs and activities of the Appalachian Regional Commission. However, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1982 continued the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian Regional Development Programs for 1983 at essentially the 1982 level. The Committee's action is consistent with that legislation and S. 2144 which has passed the Senate and which provides for a 1-year reauthorization of ARC programs.

In action on this appropriation last year, the Congress began a phase-down of ARC programs and activities and the recommendation here continues in that direction. The Committee feels that this finish-up program should occur over the next 3 to 5 years and that it should be consistent with S. 2144 in emphasizing job creation, with special emphasis in those distressed counties of the region where there has been the lack of even the most basic facilities and services, and the extension of basic health care to those counties now without it.

In an effort to insure an orderly finish-up of ARC Area Development Programs, the Committee directs that not to exceed 50 percent of the total cost of an activity be financed by ARC except in those priority areas and activities mentioned above. Further, the Committee expects the Commission to prioritize its programs to insure that only those efforts which provide the most immediate impact and payoff are approved. The Committee feels that these steps are necessary to allow the Appalachian States to assume a greater financial responsibility during the finish-up period while still providing for the needs of the region.

The Committee would like to stress and cannot over emphasize how important the role of the Federal cochairman will be during the next few years. The Committee expects the cochairman to implement the changed emphasis and direction, and to provide that critical review and restraint that will be necessary as the Federal Government gradually withdraws. Further, the Committee is aware that the Governors of the Appalachian States are considering submitting applications within three separate allocations as opposed to the normal single allocation system which has been used since 1975. The Committee expects that, whatever system is utilized, the funding be targeted at those projects and activities with the most direct and immediate impact.

The importance of the Appalachian highway system to the economic development of the region has been clearly demonstrated and the Committee feels that the allocation of Appalachian Highway Development funds should be made based on need and each segments contribution to the economic well-being of the area.

The following table shows the distribution of the funds recommended along with the House allowance and budget request:

[In thousands of dollars]

	1982 appropriation	1983 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Appalachian highways	100,000	[1] 80,000	95,000	95,000
Area development programs	44,500		50,000	49,200
Local development districts and technical assistance	5,500			5,000
Total, program	150,000	80,000	145,000	149,200
Less unobligated balances				−4,200
Total appropriation	150,000	80,000	145,000	145,000

[1] Included under Department of Transportation, "Federal Highway Administration" budget request.

Delaware River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1982	$121,000
Budget estimate, 1983	165,000
House allowance	165,000
Committee recommendation	165,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee concurs with the House allowance of $165,000, the same as the budget request.

This appropriation provides the full budget estimate for salaries and expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff in representing interests of the Federal Government in the Delaware River Basin Commission.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1982	$269,000
Budget estimate, 1983	227,000
House allowance	269,000
Committee recommendation	227,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	−42,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $227,000, which is the same as the budget request.

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission.

Susquehanna River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1982	$120,000
Budget estimate, 1983	
House allowance	165,000
Committee recommendation	165,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+165,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends $165,000 for salaries and expenses of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, which is the same as the House allowance.

The 1983 budget proposed consolidation of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission with the Delaware River Basin Commission establishing a single Commission on the Delaware and Susquehanna River Basins. The Committee believes that such a consolidation would adversely impact the flexibility in addressing the problems and solutions in each basin. The Committee feels that, given the unique features and conditions of the Delaware and Susquehanna Rivers, the Commissions should not be consolidated.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1982	$217,000
Budget estimate, 1983	185,000
House allowance	185,000
Committee recommendation	217,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $217,000 which is $42,000 over the House allowance and budget request.

The Committee feels that in view of the Commission's work in the area of flood damage reduction and water supply that the program should be continued at the 1982 level.

Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriations, 1982	$55,000
Budget estimate, 1983	
House allowance	
Committee recommendation	65,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+65,000
House allowance	+65,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $65,000 for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1940 by compact among the four States in the basin, Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, plus the District of Columbia and Federal Government. The Commission has the responsibility for basinwide water quality, planning, program coordination and assistance.

The Committee feels that the Commission has played a unique role in coordinating the water supply activities in the National Capital region and has demonstrated its effectiveness in bringing about cost-effective solutions in meeting the regions present and future water supply needs. Therefore, the Committee does not concur with the termination of this entity.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1982	$465,700,000
Budget estimate, 1983	479,500,000
House allowance	474,500,000
Committee recommendation	474,500,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−5,000,000
House allowance	

LOAN PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
ARIZONA					
GILA RIVER FARMS....................................	13,888,000	10,879,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
CALIFORNIA					
COLUSA COUNTY WATER DISTRICT........................	12,316,000	---	---	900,000	---
EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT NO. 2..............	17,320,000	7,230,000	6,909,000	6,909,000	6,909,000
GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT....................	16,968,000	7,067,000	9,901,000	9,901,000	9,901,000
GLIDE WATER DISTRICT................................	5,875,000	---	---	2,975,000	---
RAINBOW MUNICIPAL WATER DIST, IMPROVEMENT DIST NO. 6..	2,970,000	1,301,000	1,669,000	1,669,000	1,669,000
SAN BENITO CO. WATER CONSERV.& FLOOD CONTROL DIST.....	19,717,000	2,704,000	7,253,000	7,253,000	7,253,000
YUBA COUNTY WATER DISTRICT..........................	21,482,000	---	---	2,600,000	---
YOLO-ZAMORA WATER DISTRICT..........................	---	---	---	200,000	---
NEBRASKA					
CENTRAL NEBR.PUBLIC POWER & I.D.-PHELPS SYSTEM IMPROV.	10,350,000	4,963,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000

LOAN PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
TEXAS					
HIDALGO CO. WATER CON.& IMPROV. DIST. NO.1 (EDINBURG).	7,497,000	4,649,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
HIDALGO COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO.2 (SAN JUAN)....	16,078,000	4,582,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
DELTA LAKE IRRIGATION DISTRICT......................	10,970,000	5,948,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
WYOMING					
GARLAND CANAL POWER PROJECT.........................	3,087,000	2,909,000	178,000	178,000	178,000
VARIOUS					
CONSTRUCTION COST INCREASES.........................	5,110,000	2,110,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	1,000,000
ADMINISTRATION OF LOAN PROGRAM......................	9,905,000	6,191,000	673,000	673,000	673,000
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND DELAYS....................................	---	---	-2,183,000	-2,183,000	-8,183,000
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM............................			39,600,000	46,275,000	31,600,000

REVENUES APPLIED

Revenues applied, 1982	
Budget estimate, 1983	
House allowance	−$60,000,000
Committee recommendation	
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	+60,000,000

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1982	$465,700,000
Budget estimate, 1983	479,500,000
House allowance	414,500,000
Committee recommendation	474,500,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−5,000,000
House allowance	+60,000,000

An appropriation of $474,500,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same amount as the House and $5,000,000 below the budget requet. The $5,000,000 decrease is a general reduction to the account.

The Committee recognizes the critical importance of the nuclear regulatory program, including the need to assure the protection of the public health and safety. The Committee also is fully aware of the need to continue to address the nuclear powerplant licensing backlog. As noted in the House report, the Commission has shown improvement in the handling of operating license requests and construction permits. The Commission has initiated a program to recover from the delays in issuing operating licenses that resulted from the accident at Three Mile Island. During fiscal year 1983, the Commission should pay particular attention to plants scheduled for completion and licensing in 1984. The Commission should identify early those plants that are likely to be strongly contested and allow sufficient staff and hearing time for those contested plants to be licensed without unnecessary delay.

Nuclear data link.—The Committee recommendation restores the House reduction and includes the requested funding for the nuclear data link system. This prototype system is designed to improve emergency response and enhance the quality and quantity of technical data available to NRC headquarters emergency response personnel.

Uranium mill licensing requirements.—The House of Representatives adopted a provision that would prohibit the use of appropriated funds by the NRC to implement or enforce any portion of the uranium mill licensing regulations promulgated by the Commission on October 3, 1980.

The Committee agrees with the House that the Commission should not have adopted these technical requirements for uranium mill tailings prior to EPA's promulgation of final environmental standards.

The provision would prevent the Commission from implementing or enforcing the technical requirements in uranium mill licensing regulations promulgated by the NRC on October 3, 1980, or from adopting by regulation similar technical requirements during fiscal year 1983 until EPA promulgates its final environmental standards for uranium mill tailings at active uranium mill sites. However, the NRC would retain its authority to regulate uranium mill tailings on a case-by-case basis in the manner and to the extent permitted prior to the promulgaton of its uranium mill licensing regulations. Thus, the Commission would retain the authority to impose through license conditions those requirements for the management of uranium mill tailings that the Commission can demonstrate in each case are necessary to protect the public health, safety, and the environment. This preserves the situation in effect prior to the promulgation of the NRC uranium mill licensing regulations. The provision is intended to permit the Commission also to retain its authority under UMTRCA to promulgate by regulation technical requirements of uranium mill tailings after EPA promulgates its final environmental standards for uranium mill tailings at active sites.

High temperature gas reactor.—The orderly development of the high temperature gas reactor (HTGR) requires concurrent development of the regulatory framework. The Committee believes that the NRC should be prepared to license the next HTGR plant without significant unresolved issues affecting the process; to develop safety criteria for HTGR's; to provide whatever guides and standards may be appropriate on a timely basis; and to extend the scope of NRC rules to include the HTGR.

The Committee recommends that the necessary resources be provided for NRC's HTGR related activities.

NRC consolidation.—The Committee has not included bill provisions on interim consolidation of NRC offices as proposed by the House.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriations, 1982	$129,162,000
Budget estimate, 1983	119,490,000
House allowance	126,690,000
Committee recommendation	107,065,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−12,425,000
House allowance	−19,625,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $107,065,000, which is $19,625,000 under the House allowance and $12,425,000 below the budget request.

This Committee has a 50-year history of support for the Tennessee Valley Authority. We reaffirm that support on its 50th birthday and recognize that TVA programs continue to be of enormous benefit to the region and the Nation especially at a time when economic survival is such a vital issue.

While the Committee has supported increases in some program areas, adjustments have been made where the rate of increase appears greater than warranted.

The Committee believes that the original budget justifications of the Tennessee Valley Authority need to be strengthened. More attention needs to be given in the original budget document to explaining in specific terms why the funds are needed, how they are to be used, and what results TVA expects to achieve. Further, the justification material must address more directly those areas when increases and new initiatives are proposed. The Committee directs TVA to work with the Committee staff to establish a suitable format and narrative detail to support their original budget request.

During this period of shrinking Federal budgets, the Committee feels that it is imperative that each Federal agency, including TVA be required to reevaluate past programs and activities, which were begun for the most part in times of economic prosperity. Last year, the Committee expressed its concern about what appeared to be duplication of work. In response to those concerns, TVA has taken actions to eliminate possible duplication and is to be commended for its efforts. The Committee encourages similar action in the future.

The Committee is aware of the increasing interest and desire to involve TVA in work outside the Tennessee Valley region. While the Committee does not object to limited technical assistance, the Committee strongly believes that TVA's responsibility is to the people of the Tennessee Valley and that, notwithstanding the need for development in other areas of the country, TVA should not be involved in economic or other development demonstration efforts unless specifically authorized and approved by the appropriate legislative committees and the Committees on Appropriations.

COLUMBIA DAM, TENN.

The Committee wishes to note a number of milestones which have been reached on the Tennessee Valley Authority's Columbia Dam project in recent months. The Tennessee Water Quality Board ruled in April 1981 that the project would meet State water quality standards. The Corps of Engineers' section 404 permit for the project was issued in August 1981. The major obstacle to the final construction phase of the project has been the success of the transplant program for endangered species of mussels from the project area. TVA just this month has completed the transplant of the mussels from the Duck River to several new sites in Tennessee rivers.

Diversion of the stream and resumption of construction on the dam will require demonstration of success of the mussel transplant program. The Committee urges the interagency committee, TVA, EPA, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the States of Alabama, Virginia, and Tennessee, to act expeditiously on their recommendation to the Fish and Wildlife Service for a favorable determination on the success of the transplant program.

The following table shows the allocation of the funds recommended for activities under this heading:

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1982 allocation	1983 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
CAPITAL INVESTMENT				
Water resources development:				
New lock at Pickwick Lock and Dam	22,015	22,970	22,970	22,970
Columbia Dam and Reservoir		2,000	2,000	2,000
Additions and improvements	1,840	2,836	2,836	2,836
Land, forest, and recreational resources development:				
Recreation facilities	246	100	100	100
Land Between the Lakes	1,480	215	215	215
Community development:				
Local flood damage prevention projects	1,750	700	700	700
National fertilizer development, chemical facilities:				
Curtain granulation unit	2,358	1,601	1,601	1,601
Railroad tank car replacement	325	1,225	1,225	1,225
High-nitrogen suspension	500	872	872	872
Water pollution control facilities		399	399	399
Replacements, improvements, and pollution abatement and support facilities	1,788	1,118	1,118	1,118
Ammonia-from-coal facilities	539	183	183	183
General services facilities	1,853	2,518	2,518	1,918
Subtotal, capital investment	37,047	36,737	36,737	36,137
EXPENSES				
Natural resources:				
Water resources	2,701	2,983	2,983	2,983
Reservoir system operations	15,594	17,505	17,505	17,005
Land and forest resources	3,576	3,978	3,978	3,978
Resource management and development resources	2,105	2,619	2,619	2,294
Land Between the Lakes	5,088	6,235	6,235	5,935
Economic and community resources:				
Economic resources	9,339	8,100	13,050	7,800
Community resources	5,202	4,600	4,600	4,400
Agriculture resources development	3,739	3,700	4,950	3,500
National fertilizer development	27,034	25,672	26,672	25,672
Ammonia from coal	5,304	5,731	5,731	5,731
General services	605	640	640	640
Subtotal, expenses	92,115	81,763	88,963	79,938
Inland waterway trust fund		990	990	990
General reduction based on anticipated savings and efficiencies, and unobligated balances				-10,000
Total appropriation	129,162	119,490	126,690	107,065

WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

Appropriations, 1982	$3,888,000
Budget estimate, 1983	
House allowance	500,000
Committee recommendation	
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	−500,000

The Committee recommends that no funds be appropriated for the Water Resources Council as proposed in the 1983 budget.

The Water Resources Council has been without authorization for appropriations since 1979, but has continued to be funded by the Committee in the Energy and Water Development Appropriation Acts.

The Committee feels that based on the Senate action in denying funding in the continuing resolution (H.J. Res. 599) and the lack of authorizing legislation for the Water Resources Council or some other entity with responsibility for national water resource policy that it cannot recommend further appropriations.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED PURSUANT TO SEC. 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount in bill	Committee allocation	Amount in bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with the Committee allocation to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1983: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development	14,000	13,535	13,500	[1]13,288
Projections of outlays associated with budget authority recommended in the bill:				
1983				[2]7,466
1984				4,660
1985				1,151
1986				203
1987 and future year				55
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1983 in the bill		143		7

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority.
[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1982 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1983

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual, action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are not included in the accompanying bill.]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1982	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1983	Increase or decrease
PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY			
FEDERAL FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Permanent appropriations	$7,100,000	$7,400,000	+$300,000
Department of the Interior: Bureau of Reclamation: Miscellaneous appropriations	2,700,000	2,700,000	
Department of Energy: Payments to States under Federal Power Act	85,000	85,000	
Continuing fund, Southeastern Power Administration	50,000		-50,000
Bonneville Power Administration Fund (authority to borrow)	279,720,000	179,000,000	-100,720,000
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund (authority to borrow)	1,627,705,000	1,695,962,000	+68,257,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds	1,917,360,000	1,885,147,000	-32,213,000
TRUST FUNDS			
Rivers and harbors contributed funds	70,000,000	71,000,000	+1,000,000
Department of the Interior: Reclamation trust funds	8,352,000	13,800,000	+5,448,000
Department of Energy: Advances for cooperative work	5,630,000	3,606,000	-2,024,000
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust fund accounts	5,000,000		-5,000,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds	88,982,000	88,406,000	-576,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1982 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1983

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1982 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1982 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,649,609,000	1,350,715,000	1,541,258,000	1,577,992,000	-71,617,000	+227,277,000	+36,734,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	343,370,000	217,456,000	288,356,000	249,656,000	-93,714,000	+32,200,000	-38,700,000
(By transfer)	(14,000,000)	---	---	---	(-14,000,000)	---	---
Subtotal	1,992,979,000	1,568,171,000	1,829,614,000	1,827,648,000	-165,331,000	+259,477,000	-1,966,000
Nuclear Fuel Cycle Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,438,199,000	1,729,371,000	1,703,621,000	1,693,871,000	+255,672,000	-35,500,000	-9,750,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	693,716,000	734,450,000	714,500,000	654,450,000	-39,266,000	-80,000,000	-60,050,000
Subtotal	2,131,915,000	2,463,821,000	2,418,121,000	2,348,321,000	+216,406,000	-115,500,000	-69,800,000
Gross revenues	-1,805,000,000	-2,332,700,000	-2,307,700,000	-2,307,700,000	-502,700,000	+25,000,000	---
Revenues unapplied	---	365,654,000	---	---	---	-365,654,000	---
Subtotal	326,915,000	496,775,000	110,421,000	40,621,000	-286,294,000	-456,154,000	-69,800,000
General Science and Research Activities:							
Operating Expenses	423,892,000	483,670,000	483,120,000	482,120,000	+58,228,000	-1,550,000	-1,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	118,810,000	117,300,000	118,085,000	125,085,000	+6,275,000	+7,785,000	+7,000,000
Subtotal	542,702,000	600,970,000	601,205,000	607,205,000	+64,503,000	+6,235,000	+6,000,000

Atomic Energy Defense Activities:							
Operating Expenses	3,677,003,000	4,524,040,000	4,454,740,000	4,379,450,000	+702,447,000	-144,590,000	-75,290,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	1,078,565,000	1,401,641,000	1,306,841,000	1,328,041,000	+249,476,000	-73,600,000	+21,200,000
Subtotal	4,755,568,000	5,925,681,000	5,761,581,000	5,707,491,000	+951,923,000	-218,190,000	-54,090,000
Departmental administration:							
Operating Expenses	333,494,000	243,553,000	381,120,000	377,088,000	+43,594,000	+133,535,000	-4,032,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	3,613,000	1,715,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	-1,313,000	+585,000	---
Miscellaneous revenues	-167,900,000	-82,855,000	-214,155,000	-114,155,000	+53,745,000	-31,300,000	+100,000,000
Subtotal	169,207,000	162,413,000	169,265,000	265,233,000	+96,026,000	+102,820,000	+95,968,000
Subtotal, Department of Energy	7,787,371,000	8,754,010,000	8,472,086,000	8,448,198,000	+660,827,000	-305,812,000	-23,888,000
Operating Expenses	(5,549,297,000)	(6,281,448,000)	(6,042,004,000)	(6,088,666,000)	(+539,369,000)	(-192,782,000)	(+46,662,000)
Plant and Capital Equipment	(2,238,074,000)	(2,472,562,000)	(2,430,082,000)	(2,359,532,000)	(+121,458,000)	(-113,030,000)	(-70,550,000)
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS							
Alaska Power Administration, operation and maintenance	3,538,000	2,809,000	3,109,000	3,109,000	-429,000	+300,000	---
Bonneville Power Administration Fund							
Borrowing Authority	---	276,000,000	276,000,000	276,000,000	+276,000,000	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(40,000,000)	(62,000,000)	(62,000,000)	(62,000,000)	(+22,000,000)	---	---
Southeastern Power Administration, operation and maintenance	7,237,000	11,848,000	8,448,000	11,848,000	+4,611,000	---	+3,400,000
Southwestern Power Administration, operation and maintenance	21,269,000	34,290,000	23,690,000	34,290,000	+13,021,000	---	+10,600,000
Western Area Power Administration, construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance	210,774,000	207,200,000	174,200,000	207,200,000	-3,574,000	---	+33,000,000
Western Area Power Administration, emergency fund	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	---	---	---
Subtotal	243,318,000	532,647,000	485,947,000	532,947,000	+289,629,000	+300,000	+47,000,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1982 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1983—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

					Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
Item (1)	1982 Appropriation (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Committee recommendation (5)	1982 Appropriation (6)	Budget estimate (7)	House allowance (8)
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	76,177,000	92,500,000	89,100,000	89,100,000	+12,923,000	-3,400,000	---
Revenues Applied	---	-60,000,000	-60,000,000	-60,000,000	-60,000,000	---	---
Subtotal	76,177,000	32,500,000	29,100,000	29,100,000	-47,077,000	-3,400,000	---
GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND							
Geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program	2,200,000	75,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	---	+2,125,000	---
Total, title I, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of Energy	8,109,066,000	9,319,232,000	8,989,333,000	9,012,445,000	+903,379,000	-306,787,000	+23,112,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL							
Department of the Army							
Corps of Engineers - Civil							
General investigations	137,225,000	129,250,000	158,779,000	136,543,000	-682,000	+7,293,000	-22,236,000
Construction, general	1,429,992,000	1,209,350,000	1,252,857,000	1,233,100,000	-196,892,000	+23,750,000	-19,757,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	40,000,000	---	---	7,000,000	-33,000,000	+7,000,000	+7,000,000

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries......	256,310,000	282,000,000	305,090,000	285,564,000	+29,254,000	+3,564,000	-19,526,000
Operation and maintenance, general....................	1,025,355,090	1,011,000,000	1,150,996,000	1,137,928,000	+112,573,000	+126,928,000	-13,068,000
General expenses......................................	96,000,000	99,000,000	99,000,000	99,000,000	+3,000,000	---	---
Special recreation use fees...........................	4,784,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	+1,216,000	---	---
Total, title II, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of Defense - Civil......	2,989,666,000	2,736,600,000	2,972,722,000	2,905,135,000	-84,531,000	+168,535,000	-67,587,000
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Bureau of Reclamation							
General investigations................................	30,596,000	36,485,000	37,435,000	33,362,000	+2,766,000	-3,123,000	-4,073,000
Construction program..................................	548,505,000	666,585,000	670,491,000	638,785,000	+90,280,000	-27,800,000	-31,706,000
(Liquidation of contract authority)...............	(3,000,000)	---	---	---	(-3,000,000)	---	---
Operation and maintenance.............................	118,518,000	140,850,000	142,306,000	136,850,000	+18,332,000	-4,000,000	-5,456,000
(By transfer).....................................	(2,000,000)	---	---	---	(-2,000,000)	---	---
Loan program..	22,614,000	39,600,000	46,275,000	31,600,000	+8,986,000	-8,000,000	-14,675,000
(Limitation on direct loans)......................	(26,922,000)	(38,839,000)	(45,514,000)	(30,839,000)	(+3,917,000)	(-8,000,000)	(-14,675,000)
General administrative expenses.......................	39,928,000	49,300,000	49,300,000	45,300,000	+5,372,000	-4,000,000	-4,000,000
Emergency Fund..	---	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	---	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation......................	760,161,000	933,820,000	946,807,000	886,897,000	+126,736,000	-46,923,000	-59,910,000
Total, title III, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of the Interior.........	760,161,000	933,820,000	946,807,000	886,897,000	+126,736,000	-46,923,000	-59,910,000
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Appalachian Regional Commission: Salaries and Expenses	2,900,000	---	2,700,000	2,700,000	-200,000	+2,700,000	---
Funds Appropriated to the President:							
Appalachian regional development programs.........	150,000,000	80,000,000	145,000,000	145,000,000	-5,000,000	+65,000,000	---

Tennessee Valley Authority:							
Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority Fund........	129,162,000	119,490,000	126,690,000	107,065,000	-22,097,000	-12,425,000	-19,625,000
Water Resources Council:							
Water resources planning............................	3,888,000	---	---	---	-3,888,000	---	---
Salaries and expenses...............................	---	---	500,000	---	---	---	-500,000
Total, title IV, new budget (obligational) authority, independent agencies...............	752,432,000	679,567,000	690,174,000	730,104,000	-22,328,000	+50,537,000	+39,930,000
Total, titles I, II, III and IV:							
New budget (obligational) authority...........	12,611,325,000	13,669,219,000	13,599,036,000	13,534,581,000	+923,256,000	-134,638,000	-64,455,000
(Liquidation of contract authority)...........	(3,000,000)	---	---	---	(-3,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans)..................	(66,922,000)	(100,839,000)	(107,514,000)	(92,839,000)	(+25,917,000)	(-8,000,000)	(-14,675,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1982 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1983—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

					Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
Item (1)	1982 Appropriation (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Committee recommendation (5)	1982 Appropriation (6)	Budget estimate (7)	House allowance (8)
Delaware River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	121,000	165,000	165,000	165,000	+44,000	---	---
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	269,000	227,000	269,000	227,000	-42,000	---	-42,000
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	390,000	392,000	434,000	392,000	+2,000	---	-42,000
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin: Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	55,000	---	---	65,000	+10,000	+65,000	+65,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	120,000	---	165,000	165,000	+45,000	+165,000	---
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	217,000	185,000	185,000	217,000	---	+32,000	+32,000
Total, Susquehanna River Basin Commission	337,000	185,000	350,000	382,000	+45,000	+197,000	+32,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	465,700,000	479,500,000	474,500,000	474,500,000	+8,800,000	-5,000,000	---
Revenues Applied	---	---	-60,000,000	---	---	---	+60,000,000
Total, Nuclear Regulatory Commission	465,700,000	479,500,000	414,500,000	474,500,000	+8,800,000	-5,000,000	+60,000,000